

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

If the Bible is not read and studied with intelligence to-day it is not for want of guidance. Books for class work and study circles have been so multiplied in recent years that one might be tempted to think that the field had been adequately covered. Yet there is always room for something fresh.

We have pleasure in calling attention to a little book of quite distinctive character and excellence. Its title is *Preface to Bible-Study*, by the Rev. Canon Alan RICHARDSON, B.D.¹ The writer is examining chaplain to the Bishop of Sheffield, and has already some books to his credit. This book is 'written for those who genuinely desire to read the Bible, but who are puzzled about how to approach it,' and it admirably fulfils this aim.

It deals with such topics as Faith and the Higher Criticism, Revelation through History, Myth and History in the Old Testament, the Witness of the Old Testament to Christ. All are dealt with in a scholarly way, with the supreme aim of bringing the Christian message to light. We append some notes on a chapter entitled 'The Inspiration of the Bible' which handles this controversial topic in a very straightforward and reasonable way.

The rise of modern Biblical scholarship has made necessary a new doctrine of the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. The older theory of plenary inspiration, according to which the Bible was written word for word at the Divine dictation, became untenable as soon as it was made clear that the various writers put their own individuality into their work, and wrote to all appearance much as other fallible men write their books. The question which then naturally arose, and is often asked to-day, is, 'If, as scholars tell us, the Bible has reached its present form only through a long process of composing, compiling, editing, and copying, how can it be said to be inspired, and to be the very Word of God?'

In reply to this it has been urged that the inspiration of the Scriptures is not different in

¹ S.C.M.; 5s. net.

kind from that of other religious writings but only in degree. Let it be placed alongside of any other religious literature and it will emerge triumphant from the test. 'The Bible thus comes to be looked upon as the record of the progressive deepening of man's religious experience and of the evolution of man's knowledge of God. . . . The same God who had inspired Shakespeare or Confucius or Darwin had inspired the prophets and apostles, who had experienced His truth and had learnt to call Him holy, righteous, all-powerful, and (more especially) Father. The degree of the inspiration of the Bible, or any part of it, was to be measured by the level of truth which it contained and by its power to awaken in us a genuine experience of God.'

This theory which found wide acceptance among scholars never satisfied the common Christian mind. Whatever truth it contained it was instinctively felt to be too thin. It resembled the theory of those who accept the divinity of Christ on the ground that all men are divine in their degree. And so to-day its deficiencies are being more strongly felt. It does not answer the real question at issue, which is, 'Has God indeed spoken to man?' 'We do not deny that other religious literature contains much that is true and valuable, especially its testimony to the universal need of mankind for God, the good life, and the power to live it. But to say that the Bible contains the highest ideas about God which man can attain does not satisfy us; we do not want ideas about God, we want God.'

At the same time the idea of evolution has lost something of its magic power. Bitter experience has taught this generation that human history is not simply an upward evolution, and in particular that man's religious history is not a growing experience of God and a progressive response to God. 'It is also the record of man's repeated falling away from God, his lapsing into superstition and unbelief, his disobedience and final rejection of God.' We do not feel to-day that we stand on the summit of a great evolutionary process, but rather we are ready to say, with

the Psalmist, 'Lord from the depths to Thee I cry.' That proud optimism of prosperous pre-war days which culminated in the blasphemous anthem, 'Glory to man in the highest, for man is the master of things,' has fallen in ruins like a mightier Tower of Babel, and now our anxious quest is for some light to break through our darkness, for some help from on high, for a God who will come to the rescue and save. Are there such light and salvation in the Bible, or are there not? That is the one thing that matters.

The Bible is unique because it answers this question in the affirmative. It stands by itself, not through the excellence of its moral and religious teaching, nor through what men have said about God, but through its claim to record the message of God to man. 'The Bible is the only book in all the religious literature of the world which claims to find its significance in recording what God Himself has done and has said. It is the only book in the world of which the claim has been consistently and continuously made over several centuries that God has not merely spoken to those who wrote it in the past, but still speaks to those who read it in the present. . . . No other book claims to be a living book in this way; no other book claims that God speaks personally through it to those who read it, and no other religious tradition has claimed to possess a book which is the divinely appointed channel of God's personal intercourse with men.'

It follows from this that belief in the inspiration of the Scriptures does not mean merely assenting to the proposition that the Bible is superior to all other religious books, nor merely assenting to the theory that the Bible is the Word of God in the abstract. It is the recognition of something which is true for us personally, that the message of God to mankind is intended for us. 'In the proper Christian sense of the term, the meaning of the inspiration of Scripture for me is that I recognize that God's message has been sent into the world with my name and address on it.' It is an idle question why God should have chosen to speak to the world through this book. It is parallel to the mystery of why God should have chosen one nation as His special channel of revelation. The Bible never encourages us to think that we can ever solve this 'mystery of election' or fathom the depth of the purpose of God. The Bible does not supply infallible answers to the problem of science or philosophy, but it is the vehicle by which God addresses His personal message to us. 'It is this message, which comes through the Bible, which is authoritative for me, and it is in virtue of my hearing in it God's personal call and

offer to me that I acknowledge that the Bible is inspired.'

Thus the inspiration and authority of the Bible are inseparable from the Christian doctrine of salvation. God purposed to save the world through Christ—not through religion in general, or philosophy or science or mysticism. Christ is the only saving revelation of God, and there is salvation in no other name. God may be known in other ways, notably by the things which He has made, but the knowledge of God which saves men from their sins and restores them to fellowship with Him comes through Christ alone. And the Bible is the only first-hand record of the facts about Christ. 'Therefore the Bible alone is the source-book of saving knowledge; apart from it we know nothing of the great acts of God in Hebrew history, culminating in the fulness of time in the sending forth of His Son. The Bible is the witness to the things which God has done for the sake of us men and our salvation. . . . Its uniqueness lies not in any special miraculous method of dictation by which it was received, nor yet in any exalted state of religious experience to which its writers attained, but in its testimony to the great things that God hath done.'

In his talk about religious books lately over the wireless the Dean of St. Paul's drew attention to *The Revelation of the Word*, by the Rev. Canon H. G. ENGLAND, M.A.¹ In spite of its revolutionary, almost bizarre, contention, Dr. Matthews told us it ought to be taken seriously. He did not agree with its main thesis, but all the same there was a lot to be said for it. And certainly that thesis is startling enough.

It is difficult to put it simply, for there are several parts of it that fit together and it is not easy to say which is principal. Perhaps this is the main thing, that the Logos of St. John's prologue is not the Son but the Holy Spirit. Dr. Wheeler Robinson, in his book, 'The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit,' said: 'It is interesting to speculate on the consequences for Christian theology if the Logos idea had been linked to the Spirit instead of the Son.' And that is just what Canon ENGLAND has done. It is a mistake, he says, to interpret the Word, by which all things were made, as the Son. It was the Spirit that was meant.

'The seed is the Word of God,' Jesus said in the Parable of the Sower. Canon ENGLAND turns this

¹ Murray; 7s. 6d. net.

round and says: 'The Word of God is His seed,' and interprets the Logos statement by this. From this mysterious embodiment of latent energy all animate creation, with its infinite variety of form, takes its beginning. Thus the Logos is (as St. John says) the medium of all creation, that eternal 'offspring' of God, the Seed of which was not at first the only-begotten Son but the nucleus which in due time became 'God-only-begotten' when the Word became flesh.

It is not every offspring that attains the maturity of sonship. Whilst every word of God is a form of God's self-expression, not every particular utterance is a full self-revelation. Every word is not even directed toward sonship, else there would be no stars or emeralds, no flowers or trees, no butterflies or birds. These also are the fruit of the divine self-expression in the Word or Holy Spirit. With every new 'emergent evolution' there is an appropriate activity of the Holy Spirit, as in the case of the upward transitions from inorganic matter to organic life, from vegetable life to animal life, from animal life to human life. And then—as the climax of all this activity of the Spirit the Person of Jesus Christ is reached, the Spirit-begotten Son of God and Son of Man, in whom is represented every stage of the transitional activities of the Spirit, from material flesh to the sublime complexity of a Divine Personality.

The 'lively Word' issues with the Breath of God, and in its fullness becomes complete divine Self-revelation, the means by which God's own Image in creation is made perfect. The distinction implied in all this between the Logos and the Son is the basis of this new theory. The Spirit is the eternal agent of the Godhead through whom all life, all beauty, all order are created. And in the fullness of time through His operation the upward evolution produced the Son. This of course leads to a modification of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity and also of traditional Christology.

Let us take Christology first. The great difficulty about the traditional doctrine is this: What was happening to the rest of the universe during the period of our Lord's earthly life? How could He be ruling the worlds and at the same time lying helpless in a baby's cradle? The present Archbishop of Canterbury puts the matter with his usual clarity thus: 'To say that the infant Jesus was from His cradle exercising providential care over it all is certainly monstrous; but to deny this, and yet to say that the creative Word was so self-emptied as to have no being except in the infant Jesus is to assert that, for a certain

period, the history of the world was let loose from the control of the creative Word.'

The doctrine of Kenosis which has been devised to meet this difficulty does not really relieve it, because it implies that the ruling and providential powers of the divine Word were in abeyance by an act of self-emptying. Dr. Temple declares of this theory that its difficulties are intolerable. But Canon ENGLAND contends that these difficulties are completely surmounted by his Christology. Jesus became the Son of God, indeed became a being at all, at the Incarnation. He was not pre-existent except in the purpose of God. The Incarnation was a glorious reality because it was the complete self-expression and self-revelation of the Godhead through the operation of the Word or Spirit of God.

This should be made perfectly clear, and Canon ENGLAND does not shirk detail. Here are his words: The Spirit is 'the eternal medium of every form of embryonic reproduction, including human procreation, so that in due season, when the Spirit-seed in its highest potential impregnates the human ovum, there is "begotten" a theanthropic embryo, in which human and divine natures are united as one nature, and become identical in their essence and development from an entirely unconscious theanthropic embryo, through its own natural stages of perfect childhood, ultimately attaining to a perfect and completely self-conscious Sonship. Thus the Son of Man was born as "God-only-begotten," Deus ex Homine, Homo ex Deo, Immanuel, God-with-us.'

It is clear that in his Christology Canon ENGLAND does not give up anything of the Christian faith about Christ, except His pre-existence. What he believes in is not a human person who became divine or a divine person who became human but the begetting and becoming of a Person who was from conception both human and divine, both humanly and divinely embryonic, inheriting the universal Deity of the Godhead even as He inherited the universal Humanity of Manhood. His consciousness of divine Sonship grew with His experience. It was immature at twelve years of age. It increased markedly at His baptism. And it continued with every experience of divine accord until the climax at Calvary.

Christ was wholly God and wholly man. Moreover, Canon ENGLAND abates nothing of a full belief in the Virgin-Birth. 'This thought of embryonic Deity,' he writes, 'fully accords with, and re-establishes, the doctrine of the Virgin

Birth.' The operation of the Word or Spirit in the mother of Jesus produced what Canon ENGLAND loves to call the 'theanthropic embryo,' just as truly as the Spirit produced the beauty of the world and the beautiful things in the world.

Moreover, the author contends that 'the emphasis laid in this work on the human nature of the only-begotten Son of God, the divinely begotten Son of Man, is by no means ebionitic, denying the divinity, or even reducing our conception of the divine glory of the Saviour of mankind.' The older doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son separated the Saviour of mankind from those He came to save, and it allowed no true affinity of relationship between God and man. In both these matters this new theory is truer to facts and to faith, the author holds.

It was pointed out that this theory also is revolutionary in its doctrine of God. Because clearly until the Incarnation there was no Trinity in the Godhead but only a Binity. Instead of the eternal generation of the Son there was the eternal procession of the Spirit. And so there has been a development in the Godhead. Since the Incarnation it has been a Trinity. And who can say that that is the end and that there will be no more developments in the Deity? It is probably a pity that Canon ENGLAND has tangled up his theology with this possible 'unity in multiplicity.' It would have been better, and no way prejudicial to his main contention, if he had stopped short of this speculation.

We need not be very much shocked, however, by the idea of a Binity till the Incarnation. Dr. Denney seems to have held that Paul identified Christ and the Holy Spirit. And Professor James in his 'Varieties of Religious Experience' contemplated seriously the possibility of more distinctions in the Godhead than three. In any case Canon ENGLAND has produced a book of very earnest and sincere thinking on the greatest of all subjects. And his contentions will bear, and deserve, very earnest and sincere consideration.

That veteran theologian, Dr. J. Scott LIDGETT, has published under the title, *God and the World*,¹ a number of essays that have appeared at intervals in the 'Contemporary Review.' They were for the most part occasioned by the publication of outstanding books, such as the Gifford Lectures of

¹ Epworth Press; 6s. net.

E. W. Barnes, William Temple, and Sir Charles Sherrington, or by the occurrence of important and sometimes menacing events, in particular the outbreak of the present war.

In the nature of the case there is no formal connexion between the various chapters, but the author claims, and that justly, that they are bound together by the link of a 'consistent Christian theism.' In what follows we shall seek to illustrate that claim.

A point which he often emphasizes is that the primal Reality is personal in quality. Professor Whitehead in his 'Adventures of Ideas' affirmed that the 'ultimate creativity' of the Universe is not to be ascribed to God's volition, and that God is no more, if no less, than the aboriginal instance of this creativity. This position is here challenged in the name of a theistic faith. What justification is there, it is asked, for treating the primal Reality as 'creativity'? The concept of creativity is a pure abstraction of human thought. Abstract in itself, it is abstracted from the human consciousness, thus suggesting the very personality which it casts aside.

Here is an exposition of the general point in Dr. J. Scott LIDGETT's own words: 'The problem of the relationship of God to the World is not solved, but shelved, by positing abstract activity behind both. The evolution of the world has culminated in the appearance of personalities. The world is not only relative to personalities in the subject-object relationship, but is interpretable solely by reference to, or abstraction from, the essential contents of personality. The world is both immanent in, and objective to, human personalities. It is instrumental to their activities and growingly subservient to their wills. Personality is purposive, and as man is a dependent being, the assumption that the Source from which he springs and the Author of the ordered evolution at the head of which he stands is personal and purposive carries with it a weight of reasonableness—quite apart from the testimony of religion—to which no other assumption can approach.'

Another point that is here much emphasized is that the spiritual values of Truth, Goodness, and Beauty, which are independent of the world as scientifically explained, can only be conceived as existing if sustained by the primal Reality which is personal. The Values which man comes to reverence and pursue are the 'golden links' between him and that Reality and reveal, in forms relative to himself, the nature of Reality in itself.

The problem of evil is generally recognized as the crux of theism, and current events have brought that problem sharply before men's minds. It is a subject of frequent reference in the pages before us. The point on which Dr. J. Scott LIDGETT chiefly insists is that while the Bible bears witness to the Fatherhood of God we are too apt to think of evil as casting doubt, not upon the Divine Fatherhood, but upon the Divine omnipotence—an abstraction that arose with the allied conception of Divine sovereignty in the course of Church History. We do not say, If God is our Father, whence comes evil? We are inclined rather to say, If God is omnipotent, whence comes evil?

Under the concept of God as fatherly, as compared with that of God as omnipotent, one may make more, it is contended, of the instrumental or disciplinary view of evil (over and over again Keats' description of the world as the 'vale of soul-making' is quoted). Naturally, as Dr. Scott LIDGETT says, the existence of suffering staggers

the materialist, who is inevitably a Hedonist. From time to time also it well-nigh overwhelms the sensitive and sympathetic, even though they may not subscribe to materialism. All such overlook the many elements of beneficence by which suffering serves vitality and promotes efficiency. St. Paul even bids us rejoice in our tribulations, and Jesus, as we are told, was 'made perfect' through sufferings.

This general consideration is applicable even to the problem of sin. St. Augustine could exclaim, *Felix culpa*. To 'soul-making' freedom, with all its risks, is essential. And if we do not yet see the end of the world-process in what St. Paul terms 'the restitution of all things,' we do find ourselves implicated in a compensatory system, having its checks and its counter-checks, through which evil is being eliminated and the eventual ascendancy of good secured. Even the present incursions of power-politics and violence will not hinder the final consummation.

Cults of To-day.

V. British Israel.

BY THE REVEREND J. R. COATES, M.A., SELLY OAK COLLEGES, BIRMINGHAM.

THE success of heresies and unorthodox cults is a measure of the failure of the Church. As with Spiritualism, Christian Science, and Adventism, so with 'British Israel': its propagandists minister to real human needs, and its plausibility is largely due to its ingenuity in relating the Bible to contemporary experience and current affairs. Its theories are not supported by modern scholarship. Many of them are ridiculous. Yet there are said to be two million believers, and it may be suspected that many more are haunted by an uncomfortable feeling that there may be something in it.

What then is 'British Israel'? What is wrong with it? Why does it appeal to so many? And what should the Church do about it?

THE IDEAS.

(1) It is contended that the British and the Americans, with some other kindred peoples, are physically descended from the Ten Tribes of Northern Israel. This is based on the fact that the Bible records the removal of Israel to Assyria and Media (2 K 17⁶), and leaves them there. The

gap between 722 B.C. and to-day is filled in with speculative history and ethnology.

'Getae, Massagetae, Sacae, Scythians, Goths, Ostro-Goths, Dacians, Khumri, Milesians, Danes, Jutes, Angles, Saxons, Normans—with many another name that could be added—ALL, at last, either by trade, or simple migration, but mostly by fierce fighting and conquest the one of the other, FOUND THEIR WAY INTO THESE "ISLES OF THE WEST." They were "sifted among the nations," as God said they should be, but not a "GRAIN" has been lost, and out of them all have truly evolved the English, Scotch, Irish, Welsh of the British Empire, and the American of the United States' (L. Sapsworth, *The Bible Arch of British Israel Truth*, 94).

(2) The British Throne is the Throne of David, from whom our royal family is descended. The connecting link is a daughter of Zedekiah, the last Davidic king in Palestine. She went to Egypt with Jeremiah and Baruch after the destruction of Jerusalem in 586 B.C. (Jer 43⁵⁻⁷).

'There is a very strong Irish tradition which maintains that a learned prophet, with a princess and a scribe Brug (or Baruch), arrived in Ireland

from Egypt before 500 B.C. and that the princess was married to the then Heremon—ruling prince of Ireland. Tradition is, of course, not documented history. But it is a fact that this particular tradition fits the prophecy, and that no other chain of circumstances—documented or otherwise—in the history of the last twenty-five centuries can be fitted to the prophecy' (L. Buxton Gresty, *Blind is My Servant*, 46).

The reference is to Jer 1¹⁰ and Ezk 17²²⁻²⁴.

(3) After the division of the kingdom in the tenth century B.C., 'Israel' always means the Ten Tribes as distinct from Judah.

'The separate destinies of Israel and Judah had been settled by God long before the split. This is evident even as far back as the Exodus, for we read (Ps 114²) that "When Israel went out of Egypt, Judah was his sanctuary, and Israel his dominion"' (Gresty, p. 46).

(4) God's promises of conquest and expansion for Israel are obviously fulfilled in the British Empire, with its centre in 'the isle beyond the sea' (Jer 25²²). Specially noteworthy is our possession of Gibraltar, Malta, Cyprus, Haifa, Suez, etc., in view of the promise to Abraham: 'Thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies' (Gn 22¹⁷).

(5) The languages of the United Kingdom contain many words akin to Hebrew. Thus 'Britain' is from B'RITH (covenant); 'Tara' from TORAH (law); 'Cymru' from OMRI (king of Israel); while 'Scot' is from SCYTHIAN (one of the stages between Israelite and British); and 'Saxon' is just ISAAC'S SON.

(6) Many traits of character are identical.

'Our modern traits of obstinacy and impatience of strict authority are perfectly reflected in the many stern rebukes delivered to ancient Israel. "Ye are a stiff-necked people," fumed Moses. "Thou art obstinate; thy neck is an iron sinew and thy brow brass," complained Isaiah. And Isaiah's bitter commination: "Woe to the drunkards of Ephraim!" brings forcibly to mind the hard-drinking habits, not only of our ancient Anglo-Saxon forbears, but also those of more recent times. Our nation's easy-going guilelessness—we trusted Hitler, it must not be forgotten—is surely indicated by: "Ephraim is a cake not turned"—i.e., half-baked' (Gresty, *Op. cit.* 36).

Let us now examine briefly these six points, and one or two others.

THE FALLACIES.

(1) 'British Israel' is one of a long series of efforts to find the Lost Tribes. Since the ninth century many theories have been put forward, suggesting widely different localities as their abode, e.g.—Arabia, Abyssinia, East Africa, Afghanistan, North America, Japan.

Most modern students, however, agree with Dr. Adolf Neubauer that the search is vain. 'To

come back to our original question, Where are the Ten Tribes? We can only answer, Nowhere. . . . A greater part of them remained in Palestine, partly mixing with the Samaritans and partly amalgamating with those who returned from the Captivity of Babylon. With them many came also from the cities of the Medes, and many, no doubt, adhered to the Jewish religion which was continued in Mesopotamia during the period of the Second Temple. As to the prophetic promise that they will be gathered together in the Messianic time, we follow Akiba, who said that they will never return. . . . We can only say to those who are searching for the Lost Tribes in any part of the United Kingdom—England, Scotland, Wales or Ireland, what we said some years ago to the late great champion of the theory that the Welsh are the Lost Tribes. After expounding for more than half an hour his theory that the Cymri derive their name from Omri, and abusing our great Celtic scholar Professor Rhys for taking another view on grounds of philology and ethnology, he asked our own opinion, which we gave him in the following words: "My belief is that you are more lost than the Ten Tribes"' (*Jewish Quart. Rev.*, i. 422).

(2) Jeremiah's call to plant is naturally associated with his constructive teaching, e.g. concerning the New Covenant. There is no sort of connexion between this and the (much later and probably scribal) saying in Ezk 17²². Gresty makes an unfortunate reference to the Hebrew here. 'We reasonably deduce that the "tender twig" is one of the king's young daughters, particularly as the Hebrew for this expression denotes the feminine' (*op. cit.* 45). The word for 'a tender one,' like 'it' in the following verse, is masculine. The king's daughter cannot possibly be meant. And 'the mountain of the height of Israel' simply cannot mean a new land, as Gresty says it does. This is typical of 'British Israel.' It is just slipshod ignorance posing as originality. It may be added that the journey to Egypt was against the will of God (Jer 43⁷).

(3) Both the writers quoted make use of *Nehemiah*, but fail to see that in this Book Judah is Israel—or all that remains of it. (See Neh 2¹⁰ 7⁷. 61. 73 9¹. 2 10³⁹ 11³. 20 12⁴⁷ 13³.)

(4) No doubt Pantellaria, Lampedusa, and Sicily will now be added to the list of 'gates.' But (*pace* the late Lord Fisher) the word 'gate' in Gn 22¹⁷ merely stands for 'cities'—as it reads in the Septuagint. There is a similar misunderstanding in the case of the word for 'isle' (Jer 25²², etc.), which really means 'coastland,' as noted in the R.V. margin, and cannot possibly refer to Britain.

(5) If all 'British Israel' arguments were as entertaining as these delightful derivations, the

reading of its books would certainly have its compensations. 'Cymru' is perhaps the most intriguing. The *Concise Oxford Dictionary* gives its origin as Old Celtic COMBROGES (compatriots). But that is far too tame. We must go back to the inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser and Sargon (why not Shalmaneser too, a century earlier, and the Moabite Stone?) to find the début of Wales on the stage of history in the person of the father of Ahab, who 'dealt wickedly above all that were before him' (1 K 16²⁵). Which no doubt explains many things.

(6) The Israelites were obstinate and given to over-indulgence in liquor—a half-baked people. The Anglo-Saxons are like that. Therefore they are Israelites! Logic is not a strong-point with 'British Israel.' Neither is a sense of humour.

(7) But the discussion of details is endless and generally fruitless. The whole thing is wrong from the start in its conception of the Bible. Law, Prophets, Writings, Gospels, Epistles—all are on the same level, to be read as flat, mathematical prose. The Old Testament is more important than the New—excepting the Book of Revelation. The Word of God is a sort of Bradshaw's Timetable in cypher, instead of being 'living and active and sharper than any two-edged sword, . . . quick to discern the thoughts and intents of the heart.'

(8) A more serious criticism of 'British Israel' would seem to be that it disregards the words of John the Baptist: 'Begin not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father,' and has not pondered sufficiently Paul's saying, 'He is not a Jew, which is one outwardly.' May we not also appropriately quote the Lord Himself? 'The flesh profiteth nothing.'

(9) Perhaps the final charge against 'British Israel' should be that it is too dogmatic. Its air of infallibility must awaken our pity. Its intolerance betokens hidden fear, and if there is any cure for this it will be in psychotherapy, involving re-education. But if curing be beyond most of us, prevention may be within our powers. We must try to understand the hunger which drives people to swallow such strange food.

THE APPEAL.

Why does this sort of thing appeal to modern men and women?

(a) It may be suggested that those who accept it are captivated by what appears to be Biblical sanction for the *Herrenvolk* type of patriotism; and that may be true in some cases. But no sweeping condemnation will suffice. We must try to sympathize with the people though we reject the doctrine. It is clear that they are very patriotic, and want to be religious in their patriotism.

(b) They want to understand their Bibles, and to find out in what sense 'This means me.'

(c) They are feeling after a philosophy of history; and try to see Bible history as an integral part of world history which gives meaning to the whole.

(d) They are hungering and thirsting for the living God who is working out His eternal purposes here and now.

(e) Unconsciously they seek an adequate doctrine of the Church, the Israel of God.

THE MORAL.

What then are we to do about it? Our brief study shows that in 'British Israel' many people find satisfaction for needs which ought to be supplied more adequately by the Church in its regular ministries. The following matters seem to be especially important in relation to the needs noted above.

(a) The consecration of patriotism. No doubt the war is helping to clear our minds on this subject, but we still have a long way to go.

(b) More and better Bible teaching. Fuller study of the successive codes of Law as landmarks of social and religious progress towards the Sermon on the Mount. Deeper treatment of the Prophets as miracles on the way to the Incarnation. Closer relating of Old and New Testaments. Better presentation of the Christian experience behind the New Testament.

(c) Larger treatment of the later literature of the Old Testament, in which Hebrew faith replies to the challenge of Greek humanism; with special attention to the philosophy behind apocalypse. In every pulpit there ought to be courses of sermons on *Daniel* and *Revelation*, and study of these Books in every Bible Class. Nothing is more relevant to the crisis of to-day.

(d) All Bible teaching and preaching should be animated by the faith expressed in the name JEHOVAH, proclaiming the God who authenticates Himself as livingly present to men in concrete historical situations. (Not 'the Eternal' but 'the Omnitemporal'.)

(e) The doctrine of Israel must be central, as it was for Jesus, and must be presented historically, as exhibiting the unity of the Bible and the meaning of the universe.

NOTE.—The following books may be recommended: Cook, *The Old Testament: a Reinterpretation*, and *The 'Truth' of the Bible*; Dodd, *History and the Gospel*; Gillet, *Communion in the Messiah*; Hebert, *The Throne of David*; Kiddle, *Revelation*; Lüthi, *The Church to Come*; Macmurray, *The Clue to History*; Phythian-Adams, *The People and the Presence*; Wells, *Daniel, a Modern Prophet*. 'British Israel' books are published by Robert Banks & Sons, London and Commonwealth Publishing Co., Birmingham.

Literature.

A TRIBUTE TO DR. A. C. KNUDSON.

A BOOK of essays has been recently published as a tribute of affection and gratitude to Dean Emeritus Albert Cornelius Knudson of Boston University School of Theology from former students and long-time friends and associates. The Editor is Professor Edgar Sheffield Brightman of the Department of Philosophy at Boston University, and the general subject of the essays is indicated by the title of the book, which is, *Personalism in Theology* (Boston University Press; \$2.50).

Dr. A. C. Knudson, an American who comes of pure Norwegian stock, and who was educated at the Universities of Minnesota and Boston, Jena and Berlin, is not so well known in Britain by his writings as in our opinion he should be. His two companion volumes, 'The Doctrine of God' and 'The Doctrine of Redemption,' make a useful and attractive contribution to Christian Doctrinal Theology from a liberal standpoint; and in them he shows himself to be deeply interested in the philosophical aspects of the subject.

The philosophy by which he takes his stand, and for which he owes much to his teacher, Borden P. Bowne, is widely known in America as Personalism. The actual phrase is not commonly used on this side of the Atlantic, though the principle it embodies is quite familiar. Briefly stated, it is that human personality furnishes the clue to the nature of Ultimate Reality. In the light of this principle, and in loyalty to it, the essays in this volume have been written.

Here is the plan of the volume. After an account and appreciation of the life and work of Dr. A. C. Knudson there comes an account of the part played by Bowne in laying the foundations of American personalism. After that the subject of personalism is reviewed in a series of special studies. First comes an exposition of personality as a metaphysical principle (this from the Editor's pen); then a discussion of the personalistic view of Nature, followed by a cognate discussion of the relationship between science and religion; then a discussion of the personality of God, followed by one of the problems of divine sovereignty and human freedom. Applications of personalism are next considered through studies of the Old Testament and of the trend of history. The three concluding essays are practical in emphasis, dealing with Christian Ethics, Race, and Religious Education (the last being the liveliest and most vigorous, if not the most mature, in all the book).

We recall how drastically Knudson has dealt with his colleague Brightman's theory of the 'Given,' by which a virtually dualistic solution is offered of the problem of the origin of evil; but this has not disturbed their friendship, and we are deeply appreciative of Brightman's action in editing this symposium, as also of the contributions of Knudson's other associates and friends.

There is one metaphysical point on which we desiderate a clearer statement by the essayist on 'Personalism and Nature.' After saying that personalism as a metaphysics of Nature finds nothing in physical things or space-time of an ontological character, he goes on to say that the two forms of personalistic teaching concerning the 'phenomenality' of the external universe are panpsychism and occasionalism. The first form, panpsychism, is subjected to an admirable, if brief, critical review (which includes a reference to Lotze in his earlier thought, James Ward, C. A. Richardson, and others); but the exact meaning of the ambiguous term, occasionalism, descriptive of the second form, does not appear to us to be sufficiently indicated. Yet it is the second form, as it is affirmed, that is probably accepted by the majority of personalists.

There is a passage in the last study of all which serves to bring out well the significance of personalism for psychology, ethics, education, and religion. We quote it in brief. It is there maintained that personalism, whose fight has been on many fronts, has stood steadfastly: 'on the psychological front, for consciousness behind and beyond behaviour; on the ethical front, for duties behind and beyond human desires or national ambitions; on the educational front, for ideals behind and beyond "interests" as the only sufficient motivations for teaching; and on the religious front, for a Divinity, an everliving God, unfathomably behind and beyond the achievements or failures of mechanism, history, or humanity.'

W. FULTON.

CHIASMUS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

There is much to be said for the view of a distinguished modern scholar that no theological book should consist of more than a hundred pages and that each chapter should be prefaced by a brief synopsis of the argument to follow. *Mega biblion, mega kakon*, said Callimachus. These thoughts are inspired in us by the perusal of a very long and learned study in *Formgeschichte* from America. Its title is *Chiasmus in the New Testament* (Milford; 24s. net), by Nils Wilhelm Lund, Dean of the Theological Seminary of North Park College, Chicago. The aim of the book is to show how widely diffused in the literature of both the Old and New Testaments is that literary thought-pattern which the grammarians call 'Chiasmus.'

'Chiasmus' denotes 'a contrast by parallelism in reverse order.' We find it exemplified in the maxim: 'Do not live to eat, but eat to live,' or in Dr. Dwight's stanza:

If e'er to bless thy sons,
My voice or hands deny
These hands let useful skill forsake
This voice in silence die.

This *abba* sequence may be extended further as in

this example from Augustine, always a good rhetorician :

Ibi est aurum
Ibi est palea
Ibi ignis in angusto operatur
Ignis ille non est diversus, et diversa agit
Paleam in cinerem vertit
Auro sordes tollit.

Such, in its simplest form, is *chiasmus* ; and this orderly arrangement of ideas in the first part of a sentence or paragraph with the same ideas repeated in inverse order in the second part is, as Mr. Lund shows, a characteristic Hebrew literary device which runs through the Old and New Testaments: When this literary principle has been grasped, he says, much in the Bible which we too readily adjudge to be verbose repetition takes on a considerable literary charm. So he goes through the Bible in great detail and picks out passages which clearly reveal the chiasmic structure. But before he does so, he has something to say about his predecessors in this field of research. He begins with a chapter on the study of 'form' in the Bible from Augustine to Bultmann, and then tells us something about the select few who have been aware of the presence of the chiasmic structure in Holy Scripture : notably, Bengel, the great commentator ; John Jebb, Bishop of Limerick ; Thomas Boys of London, a soldier under Wellington ; and two Scots, one John Forbes, and Professor William Milligan (*clarus pater clari filii*). His prolegomena behind him, Mr. Lund plunges in *medias res* and traces the principle of *chiasmus* in Law, Prophets, and Psalms, thus :

Ashkelon shall see it and fear
Gaza also and be very sorrowful
And Ekron ;
For her (i.e., Ekron's) expectation shall be ashamed
And the king shall perish from Gaza
And Ashkelon shall not be inhabited (Zech ix. 9).

(This example shows how the *centre* is always the turning point in the chiasmic structure.)

When he comes to consider the New Testament, Mr. Lund starts with Paul, a writer who knew well how to employ the chiasmic thought-pattern ; as witness the great hymn in praise of *Agape*, or Ph 2¹⁻¹¹. (These passages are printed chiasmically and fully explained from the point of view of form.) Then Mr. Lund turns to the discourses of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels. The Sermon at Nazareth is shown to follow chiasmic lines as is the greater Sermon on the Mount. Mr. Lund even finds the chiasmic principle controlling the arrangement of the *doings* of Jesus in the Gospels, for example in Mk 2¹³⁻³⁸ (a group of passages dealing with the Christian's attitude toward the Law). The final section of the book examines the evidence for *chiasmus* in the Apocalypse.

It is all very learned, albeit rather dull. Yet on the whole Mr. Lund seems to us to have made out his case. When we study the form of Jesus' sayings we shall have to take account not only of *parallelismus membrorum* in its various forms (synonymous, antithetic and synthetic), but also

of this deep-seated Hebrew instinct for expression in chiasmic terms. The pity is that the book is so long and expensive. A short book, say, of a hundred pages with a brief exposition of principles and a few striking examples from the manifold riches of Scripture would have brought Mr. Lund's researches within the range of the purse and the interest of the ordinary student of things Biblical.

A. M. HUNTER.

JOHN AMOS COMENIUS.

In these days of economy standards in typography and binding it is pleasant to handle a new book that is well printed and well bound, and printed, too, on good paper. For this as well as for the excellence of its matter we welcome the publication by Dr. Matthew Spinka of an interesting biography of *John Amos Comenius That Incomparable Moravian* (University of Chicago Press ; 12s. net). It is not an elaborate biography, but it should satisfy the ordinary reader ; and the scholarly student of history will find satisfaction in the lists it contains of the more important works of Comenius and about Comenius, filling some fourteen pages.

The author, who does not conceal his Protestant sympathies, has been successful in sketching the life and work of Comenius against the tragic background of the Thirty Years' War, and in investing his story with topical significance. As the religious wars of the seventeenth century in Europe drove Comenius into exile (he spent the latter, and greater, part of his long life in exile in Poland and, at the last, in Holland), so the present war of political ideologies has driven many another patriotic Czech from his homeland. Like Comenius, they long eagerly for the day of return ; unlike Comenius, as most of us are persuaded, they will see their fatherland once more.

The author is also to be complimented on the wisdom and insight of the comments on political movements and personal attitudes that are interspersed throughout this narrative.

He appears to be right in insisting that Comenius was in the first instance a minister of religion. Ordained in 1616, at the age of twenty-four, as a priest of the Unity of Brethren, he gave himself thereafter zealously to the duties of his sacred office. It was more by accident than by primary design that he became an educational reformer.

However, it is also right that in these pages much space should be given to Comenius in the rôle of educationist. A modern historian of education has said that ' what Petrarch was to the revival of learning, what Wycliffe was to religious thought, what Copernicus was to modern science, and what Bacon and Descartes were to modern philosophy, Comenius was to educational practice and thinking.' Some may think too great a claim for Descartes is here implied. It may also be thought that Comenius is here unduly exalted. But it may be agreed that, if the biographer speaks truly, Comenius' fame as an educational reformer is secure : ' he advocated a free and universal system of education, open to all and

compulsory for all; education of both sexes; pre-school home training, which went even beyond our kindergarten system; instruction in the native tongue; graded subject matter, adjusted to the psychological development of the pupils; dramatization of the subject, so that school work would as much as possible be play; close correlation of thought with things; incorporation of history and geography, drawing and manual training, in the curriculum; the fundamental importance of developing the whole personality of the pupil rather than mere training for a professional career.' It sounds more like the nineteenth or twentieth than the seventeenth century.

We should have liked to speak of Comenius not only as the author of *opera didactica* but as the 'pansophist,' the prophet of ecumenicity, and an exponent of devotional Christian mysticism. But we must be content to remark, apropos of Comenius in the last-named rôle, that this is surely an indication of the secret of a lifelong dedication to high causes and amazing activity in their pursuit: he who at the outset of his career struck the authentic mystical note in the great allegory, 'The Labyrinth of the World,' is found at the close of it striking the self-same note in the beautiful prose poem, 'The One Thing Needful.' Truly the sense of union with God in Christ must have been the constant inspiration of his life.

W. FULTON.

Robert Hall, by the Rev. Graham W. Hughes, B.A., B.D. (Carey Press; 2s. 6d. net), is a brief but enthusiastic biography of the great Baptist preacher. Pulpit oratory is one of the least stable foundations of an enduring fame, but Robert Hall had other claims upon the grateful remembrance of Christian people. He was an ardent democrat and apostle of liberty, an active social reformer, and an inspirer of Christian Missions. The writer of this biography feels that posterity has done less than justice to his memory, and that the Baptist churches are especially guilty in this respect. Whether 'a more ambitious volume' which the writer contemplates would find a public in these days may be doubted, but here we have a piece of excellent work, written in a clear style, which brings vividly before us the figure of an eminent preacher, reformer, and Christian statesman.

Follow the Gleam, by Mr. W. G. Branch (Carey Press; 3s. 6d. net), is a book written 'for young adventurers.' It gives brief biographies of twelve heroes of the faith, beginning with St. Paul and ending with F. N. Charrington. Among others are Tyndale, Carey, Wilberforce, Lincoln, Florence Nightingale, and Mary Slessor. The stories are pleasantly, if briefly, told, and the point is emphasized that these heroes were not disobedient to the vision that came to them in their youth. The record is one to quicken the pulse in generous young hearts.

A useful book on the Bible has been written

by the Ven. W. S. Moule, M.A., and published by the Church Book Room (1s. 6d. net). Its title is *The Bible: Its Contents and Message*, and that exactly describes what it is. There is no discussion of inspiration or criticism or anything of the kind. The writer simply takes the Scriptures as we find them in our Authorized Version and tells us what these contain. First of all why 'Bible'? And then, why 'Old and New Testament'? And after that a very simple description of the books in their traditional order. If any one begins to read the Bible devotionally right through, here is a good companion that will take his hand and point out the meaning of each stage in his study.

Thy Household the Church (Dacre Press; 3s. 6d. net) outlines a new approach to the problems of Reform in the Church of England. The authors, a group of Anglican clergy, are chiefly concerned with questions of government and order. In a Preface the Rev. V. A. Demant, D.Litt., Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's, explains that the writers and sponsors of the essays contained in the volume recognize that the Church of England, while standing in a vital and valuable relation to the State, derives its ministerial warrant and the structure of its order from its participation in the whole Catholic Church. At the conclusion of the eight essays comes a 'schedule of proposals' for Church Reform. Its scope is indicated by the following rubrics: the Government of the Church, the Status of the Laity, Canon Law, Ecclesiastical Courts, the Appointment of Bishops, Patronage, the Parson's Freehold, Endowments, The Unbeneficed Clergy.

A pleasant book of addresses to children which will suggest many good subjects, and which contains many stories to help those whose duty it is to address children, has been written by the Rev. S. H. Price and published by the Independent Press at the modest price of 2s. net under the title, *Cathedral Windows*, and other talks to boys and girls. There are forty-four of them. Some have seen the light first in this magazine, but all of them are good examples of what children's addresses should be—short, concrete, simple, and interesting.

The Five Books of Moses, by Dr. Oswald T. Allis (Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., Philadelphia; \$3.00), is perhaps the best anti-critical book on the Pentateuch which has appeared since the publication of Dr. Orr's great work. It is, of course, frankly controversial, seeking to establish a doctrine rather than to discover a truth. Controversy usually has several well-marked features, such as the selection of the weakest opponents as representative of the whole body, and the misrepresentation of an adversary's position. To a large extent Dr. Allis avoids both these methods. True, he makes no mention of Canon Simpson's 'Pentateuchal Criticism,' which is probably the best presentation of the Graf-

Wellhausen view in English. Nor does he allude to recent developments manifested in the work of the Gershams and Robertson—probably these came too late to be considered in his work. Sometimes, again, the writers whom he quotes would be surprised to find the meaning which could be read into their words, but this may be attributed, not to deliberate misrepresentation but to genuine misunderstanding. After all, to understand an opponent would be fatal to controversy. It is unnecessary to dwell on Dr. Allis' arguments; they follow familiar lines. What is important about the book is the full and reasonably fair treatment which he gives to the views of his opponents, together with his deeply religious feeling. A reader who is already convinced on one side or the other will probably be strengthened in his own opinion, while the judicial person who has not yet made up his mind will be left where he was before, though with fuller knowledge of the complexity of the problem.

One of the most attractive of the 'Christian News-Letter Books' recently published is *The Literary Outlook*, by Mr. S. L. Bethell, M.A. (Sheldon Press; 2s. 6d. net). The author is Lecturer in English Literature in the University College of South Wales and writes from a Christian standpoint. His main contention is that literary style is conditioned by the general social outlook and unconsciously reveals the writer's general creed. He considers in three chapters the lowbrow authors and books, the middlebrows, and the highbrows, and in these he finds a decrease progressively of religious belief. The lowbrows are, generally speaking, sound in moral and spiritual concerns (and the author considers at length the literature of 'escape' which he defends); the middlebrows have for the most part given up religious belief and even moral sanctions and reveal the influence of the prevailing naturalism; while in the highbrows scepticism has gone the full length. Apart from the writer's general thesis, his book is attractive because of the detailed criticisms of contemporary authors. In this and in other respects the book is extremely pleasant to read. It is the kind of book one begins to read for review as a duty and soon settles down to enjoy.

Some very useful work is being done by the S.P.C.K. in issuing informative little books on Christianity in Russia and the Middle East. The most recent of these is *The Foreign Missions of the Russian Orthodox Church*, by Serge Bolshakoff (3s. 6d. net). The writer does not confine himself strictly to what we are accustomed to call 'Foreign Missions,' but gives a fairly comprehensive account of the expansion of the Russian Church through the centuries. He convincingly rebuts the accusation that the Russian Church was devoid of missionary zeal. The labours of its missionaries in Siberia, China,

Japan, Alaska and elsewhere make a story of heroism and self-sacrifice of which any Church might be proud. A claim is made that the Russian Church has never sought to proselytize but is willing to co-operate with all other churches. 'As Christians of different denominations cannot unite for concerted action in the mission field unless they love and understand each other properly, every effort to promote mutual understanding is good and to be welcomed.'

Dr. W. K. Lowther Clarke, pastor, scholar, and publisher, has issued *The Prayer Book of 1928 Reconsidered* (S.P.C.K.; 3s. net). In the Preface Dr. E. G. Selwyn remarks that the Bible and its message rather than the Prayer Book and its methods must be the main pre-occupation of the Church after the war, but that none the less there may well be a serious effort to improve the Church's ways of worship. In such an effort the present volume would play a useful part. For the author of it has given a careful critical consideration of the Prayer Book of 1928, which has been tried and tested during the last fifteen years. In particular, he calls attention to literary lapses in some of the new prayers and ambiguity and confusion in the rubrics. Dr. Lowther Clarke does not, however, desire to depreciate the 1928 Book as a whole; he habitually uses most of it, and regards it as superior to the 1662 Book in most respects.

The Broadcast Talks which the Rev. W. A. L. Elmslie, Principal of Westminster College, gave over the wireless have been published as a booklet under the title, *Five Great Subjects* (S.C.M.; 1s. 6d. net). The subjects are, Christ To-day, What do We Mean by 'God?', Worship, The Choice of Good or Evil, and Facing Death. It is a great benefit to have sound, intelligent, and yet simple statements on such vital themes and by so competent a speaker. It is to be hoped that the cheap price, good printing, and attractive presentation will give to these talks a wide circulation. One additional feature that should help in this desirable object is the 'Foreword' which has been supplied by Miss Dorothy Sayers.

In the 'War-Time Survey Series' the latest issue is Part II. of *Europe in Transition—Churches under Trial*, by Mr. Alexander McLeish (World Dominion Press; 1s. net). The churches dealt with are those in Czechoslovakia, Germany, Austria, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Finland, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. It is in some ways a sad story but in others a heartening one because of the faithfulness and heroism of the Christians in these sorely tried lands. The author is thoroughly competent for the task he has undertaken, and his narrative is vivid, balanced, and deeply sympathetic. Those who desire to know the facts about the conditions of Church life under the iron heel of the oppressor will find what they seek here.

Q: A Re-examination.

BY THE REVEREND C. K. BARRETT, M.A., WESLEY COLLEGE, HEADINGLEY, LEEDS.

It is unfortunate that the widely used symbol Q is employed in different senses by different writers. Most scholars denote by it a document, now vanished but supposed once to have existed, which was known to both Matthew and Luke, and which supplied them with the material which they have in common in those passages which have no parallel in Mark. Others¹ restrict their use of the term to the common non-Markan material itself, regarded as a stratum of the Gospel tradition but not necessarily as derived from any one source. The latter definition of Q is the more scientific since it makes no assumptions which, however probable, in the nature of the case cannot be proved; and it is that which we shall adopt. It is, of course, possible that behind Q thus defined lies a common written source (Bacon's S), but it seems better, with Bacon, to denote this hypothetical source by another letter.

It is, however, the purpose of this article to call in question the theory that the material which we have called Q was all derived from one written document, and to suggest that the explanation of this common matter is not quite so simple. For it is not to be assumed that the best solution of the Synoptic Problem is the simplest. Such at least is the tendency of the most recent criticism. For example, most critics, even those who do not accept all Streeter's views, would prefer to speak, with him, of a 'Four Document Hypothesis' rather than of a 'Two Document Hypothesis.'² Bussmann's³ even more complicated analysis of the Gospel material carries the process a step further. In particular we may observe Streeter's recognition of the overlapping of his 'Q' and 'M,' and Bussmann's division of the Sayings source (*Redenquelle*) into two distinct documents. It is these two points which we wish to develop in the suggestion that the Q material, as we have defined it, is derived not from one common source, but from a number of non-Markan sources which were used by Matthew and Luke, Matthew's 'Sayings collection' overlapping

with Luke's.⁴ Just as our Mark (as is now recognized) is the product of the combination of a multiplicity of sources, so, perhaps, the Q material has been drawn from more than one source.

Towards establishing this position we can in this article take only the first negative step, of arguing that the usual view of Q (*i.e.*, that which regards it as all drawn from a single source) does not meet all the facts of the situation. As in all synoptic questions, two chief considerations arise—verbal agreement and coincidence of order. As to the general facts of the matter we cannot do better than quote Stanton⁵: 'Portions of the non-Markan matter common to the first and third Gospels are so closely alike in them that the two evangelists must have possessed these portions at least in the same written form. The arrangement, however, even of these closely similar portions is very different, not only relatively to the Synoptic outline (which is accounted for by the independent use of a second document), but also considered by themselves. The same pieces are differently united to other pieces; the same Sayings occur in wholly different contexts. Furthermore the degree of verbal similarity varies greatly in different parts. It is necessary to ask whether these differences are to be traced solely to the diverse revision and adaptation of the same document by the two evangelists.' Our investigation will therefore be directed as follows:

(i) We must consider the degree of agreement not only in words but also in traditional background (*Sitz im Leben*) between Matthew and Luke when they are reporting sayings of the same purport.

(ii) If Matthew and Luke are both using the same continuous source we should expect them to show in their use of it the same agreement in order which (in general) they show when both are following Mark. We must examine whether this is in fact the case.

I.

When both Matthew and Luke are following Mark their agreement is greatest, and is consistently great, when they repeat the words of

¹ Few in number: Bacon, in several works, *e.g.*, *Studies in Matthew*, viii.; C. H. Dodd, *Parables of the Kingdom*, 39.

² *The Four Gospels*, 223-270.

³ *Synoptische Studien*, 3 vols., 1925, 1929, 1931. In Vol. ii Bussmann argues at length that Q was drawn from two sources, one in Aramaic, one in Greek.

⁴ In an important review of Bussmann's second volume (in *Theol. Literaturblatt*, Feb. 1931) Jeremias asks why the division of R (= *Redenquelle*) should stop at R₁ and R₂; why not R₃ R₄ . . . ?

⁵ *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, ii. 46 f.

Jesus. Since a very great part of Q consists of sayings we should expect that the Matthean and Lucan forms of these sayings, if they were derived from a common source, would reveal the same verbal similarity. In some of the Q passages this is indeed the case, and in them the agreement is so close that there is no reason to doubt that they were drawn from a common written source or sources. There are, however, other passages where the agreement is much less close, and we must inquire whether it can plausibly be maintained that they too were derived by both Matthew and Luke from a common document.

By way of example we may notice first some short sayings which appear in different forms in Matthew and Luke but which must go back to the same root in the tradition.¹

Lk 6 ²⁹	Coat-stealing.
11 ⁴⁴	Pharisees and tombs.
12 ⁶	The price of sparrows.
16 ¹⁶	The Kingdom of God and violence.

It can hardly be doubted that in each of these cases Matthew and Luke both give what is substantially the same tradition; but they give it in different forms, and the differences cannot be accounted for by editorial activity. Why should Matthew have turned Luke's highway robbery into a law-suit, or *vice versa*? Was either evangelist really concerned about the difference between two a penny and five for twopence? These differences are just such as we should expect to find between sayings which had been independently transmitted. The other two instances which we have mentioned are even more interesting. In Lk 11⁴⁴ and Mt 23²⁷ the same charge is brought against the same persons by means of the same simile; but the simile is used so differently as to make the sayings entirely different. Lk 16¹⁶ (=Mt 11^{12f.}) is a saying of well-known difficulty and we shall not attempt to elucidate it; but it is clear that, whatever the original form of the logion may have been, it reached Matthew and Luke by different channels.

It is true that in the first two of these four cases Streeter explains the discrepant versions by the theory that the Matthean form has been conflated with M. This concession, however, in effect allows the point that we are making; two parallel versions of the saying existed in the tradition, and it is at least as simple to suppose that one was given by Luke, another by Matthew, as to think that Matthew has conflated the two.

We may consider also two longer Q sections. Lk 6²⁰⁻²⁶ (the Beatitudes and Woes) is ascribed by Streeter to Q; he himself says, however, of the divergence between Luke and Matthew at this point that it 'is not plausibly explained as the result of

editorial modification of a written source'; his own explanation is based upon the hypothesis that a second set of Beatitudes occurred in the source M. There is probably truth in this view; as we have shown, it confirms our opinion that pieces of the Gospel tradition were collected in different forms by Matthew and Luke. But the question is whether Matthew knew the Lucan form at all; and this turns upon the Woes, which appear in Luke only. It is clear from the symmetry of expression that the Lucan Woes and Beatitudes belong together. If therefore Matthew knew the Beatitudes he knew the Woes too; and it seems improbable that the Evangelist who expanded a few woes against the Pharisees (Lk 11) into a whole chapter (Mt 23) would show no trace in any part of his Gospel of this set of Woes. Probably then we should conclude that in the Beatitudes Matthew and Luke were using allied but different sources. Lk 13²²⁻³⁰ is a very instructive passage. The first verse is apparently editorial. Then follows a saying about the narrow door, introduced by a question. In the Matthean parallel (7^{13f.}—in the Sermon) there is no question, and the linguistic agreement is at a minimum. The only common words are εἰσελθεῖν) διὰ τῆς στενῆς, ὅτι, πολλοί, εἰσελθεῖν): without which the saying could hardly exist at all. That the two versions represent the same saying seems hardly open to doubt; but it is almost equally certain that the two streams of tradition must have diverged long before the time of Matthew and Luke. Luke proceeds (vv. 25-30) with a passage whose only link with the foregoing is the word θύρα—a mnemonic relationship which itself is probably an indication of oral tradition. It has (not very close) parallels in several parts of Matthew—in 25¹⁰⁻¹², 7^{22f.}, 8^{11f.}, 20¹⁶. The first of these passages is an inseparable part of a parable, apparently unknown to Luke. We may therefore feel confident that these two verses at least reached Matthew and Luke by different channels. The claims made by the expelled 'many' in the two Gospels are entirely different; in Matthew they themselves are Christian prophets and exorcists, while in Luke they are men who have heard Jesus teach and had table fellowship with him (*i.e.*, Luke's form of the saying is much more probably original). It is quite conceivable that Matthew himself detached the saying about those who come from the East and the West from its Lucan context and placed it in the very appropriate context which it has in his Gospel. The last verse (Lk 13³⁰) occurs in Mark as well as Q—an important reminder that we know certainly that there were parallel versions of the same saying.

It will be interesting to observe the case of

¹ Perhaps to the same sayings of Jesus; but we are not here concerned with the question of authenticity.

Lk 12⁵⁴⁻⁵⁵. There is a Matthean parallel (16^{2f.}) but it is omitted (without doubt rightly) by **AB**, other Greek MSS., the old Syriac, Coptic, and Armenian VSS. The parallel is in any case not close verbally to Luke. The course of events is clear. The original text of Matthew contained no parallel to Lk 12^{54ff.}. An early editor, noting the deficiency, supplemented the text. But he did not derive his supplement from Luke, but from a similar tradition of the same saying, which must still have been in oral or written circulation. If such an independent tradition was available then, we cannot but suppose that many more were available when, say fifty years earlier, Matthew was writing his Gospel.

We may briefly refer to one point more in this section. There are cases where differences between Matthew and Luke may be explained as translation variants. It is true that a certain amount of doubt must always attach to reconstructions of Aramaic documents, and that the Semitic experts do not always agree in their explanations. But it does seem that a sufficient number of instances¹ can be made out with sufficient probability to justify us in supposing that Matthew and Luke had, in addition to their common Greek source or sources, at least one Aramaic source.

At this point we may pause and tentatively summarize our conclusions. Neglecting the question of order, which remains to be considered, we may say that the part of the Q material where agreement is closest may be satisfactorily explained as derived from a single common Greek source; but that the remainder cannot be explained without recourse to some parallel version, and that it is simpler to suppose that Matthew and Luke in collecting their material used traditions which were similar but not identical than that they each had identical copies of one source (a supposition sufficiently improbable on geographical and historical grounds), which in the case of one of them was contaminated with a parallel version.

II.

The only scientific method of investigating the question of order is to read through Q in Matthew, noting where the parallel to each verse or part of a verse occurs in Luke; and *vice versa*. To describe this process in detail would take far too much space and we must therefore be content merely to illustrate it, and to summarize the results.

¹ For example, Lk 6²² (=Mt 5¹¹) 6²³ (=Mt 5¹²) 10⁵ (=Mt 10¹²) 11³⁹ (=Mt 23²⁵) 11⁴¹ (=Mt 23²⁹) 11⁴⁸ (=Mt 23³¹). See Moulton, *Grammar*, ii 471 f.; Wellhausen, *Einleitung*¹, 36 f.; Torrey, *The Four Gospels and Our Translated Gospels*, *passim*.

In this case also it will be best to discriminate between the larger and smaller blocks of Q; for it is generally agreed that Matthew has treated Q with a free editorial hand, and subordinated his material to his scheme of presenting the teaching of Jesus in great discourses. We must therefore observe whether he has retained groups of small sayings in the same order which we find in Luke, and also whether any common order can be observed in the larger blocks.

First we may take as our example Matthew's longest discourse, the Sermon on the Mount, which contains 107 verses. Of these 59 (making a liberal count) appear in Luke, *i.e.*, may be designated Q; and of the Q verses only 25 occur in Luke's Sermon on the Plain. When we pass to the other Q verses we find the Lucan parallels scattered throughout the central section of the Third Gospel. The saying about salt (Mt 5¹³) occurs in Lk 14^{34f.}, where it fits admirably into a discourse on discipleship (and *cf.* Mk 9⁵⁰). With this saying Matthew associates that about lamps and measures (5¹⁵), which Luke gives in 11³³, in connexion with the discourse on signs, and another saying (11³⁴⁻³⁶) which Matthew gives in a different part of the sermon (6^{22f.}). The saying about agreement with the adversary (Mt 5^{25f.}) appears in Luke's apocalyptic chapter (12⁵⁷⁻⁵⁹). The saying on divorce (Mt 5³²) has an isolated parallel in Lk 16¹⁸, which in the Lucan context is associated with the saying about the Kingdom of God and John, the Matthean form of which is in Mt 11^{12f.} (*cf.* also 5¹⁸). The Lord's Prayer (Mt 6⁹⁻¹⁵) Luke gives (with other teaching which appears in Mt 7) in his ch. 11. So the list might be continued for the whole sermon; but it will perhaps be sufficient merely to write out the Lucan parallels, and let them speak for themselves. They are: Lk 14^{34f.}; 11³³; 12⁵⁷⁻⁵⁹; 11²⁻⁴; 12^{33f.}; 11³⁴⁻³⁶; 16¹³; 12²²⁻³¹; 11⁹⁻¹³; 13^{20f.}; 13^{26f.}.

It is quite clear that no common order can be traced here. If it be urged that Matthew's editorial methods provide an adequate explanation of the phenomena, it must be answered that the explanation itself is a confession that the evidence *as it stands* affords no grounds for belief in a single common source as the origin of the Q material. Besides, the editing which we are asked to accept is, sometimes at least, of a surprising nature. Why should an editor, desiring to take over Lk 11^{33,34}, place the two verses in different contexts (Mt 5¹⁵, 6^{22f.}), and give them, by their new contexts, new meanings?

It will be well to examine next a Lucan section; we shall take one which is given by Streeter (*Four Gospels*, 274) as an example of agreement in order. The 'five items' he cites occur in Lk 10¹³⁻¹¹³². The passage opens with woes on

the Galilean cities, and there follows immediately (with a small intermission in Luke) the great Thanksgiving. It seems very probable that these two complementary sayings were connected with one another in a source common to Matthew and Luke. Next, however, comes Lk 10^{32f.}, which Matthew has placed in his parable chapter (13^{16f.}). Luke adds a Q version of the question about the great commandment, of which Matthew gives a conflated version in the Marcan position. Next come (in Luke) the Parable of the Good Samaritan and the story of Martha and Mary (both L); 11¹⁻⁴, the Lord's Prayer (parallel, Mt 6⁹⁻¹⁵); the Friend at Midnight (L); and the Answer to Prayer (parallel, Mt 7⁷⁻¹¹). Up to this point we have observed nothing that could seriously be used as evidence for the existence of a document. The next three sections in Luke (the Beelzebul controversy, the return of the evil spirit, the sign of Jonah)¹ occur together, as Streeter points out, in Matthew, though with the second and third reversed. But we should do well to notice this rearrangement, and also the fact, to which Streeter does not draw attention, that in the corresponding Matthean passage (12²⁵⁻⁴⁵) there appear also one Marcan verse (31), three M verses (34, 36f.), and three Q verses (32, 33, 35; parallels in Lk 12¹⁰, 6⁴³⁻⁴⁵). Streeter's argument, therefore, in the passage referred to, appears much less convincing when attention is given to detail.

Finally we must examine Q in broader outline. If we neglect small blocks and attend only to larger aggregations the material may be summarily presented as follows:

	Lk	Mt
A. Matter relating to John, Baptism, and the baptism of Jesus	3 ²⁻²²	3 ⁷⁻¹⁷
B. Temptations	4 ¹⁻¹³	4 ¹⁻¹¹
C. The Sermon	6 ²⁰⁻⁴⁹	5 ¹⁻⁷⁻²⁷
D. The Centurion	7 ¹⁻¹⁰	8 ³⁻¹³
E. John's Question; Discourse on John	7 ¹⁸⁻³⁵	11 ²⁻¹⁹
F. On Discipleship	9 ^{57-10²⁴}	8 ¹⁹⁻²² 9 ^{37-10¹⁸}
G. On signs; Beelzebul and Jonah	11 ¹⁴⁻³²	12 ²²⁻⁴⁵
H. Against the Pharisees	11 ³⁹⁻⁵²	23
I. For disciples in persecution	12 ²⁻¹² 22-34	10 ²⁶⁻³³ 6 ¹⁹⁻³³
J. Preparedness	12 ³⁵⁻⁵⁹ 13 ²²⁻³⁰	24 ^{43f. et al.}
K. Lament over Jerusalem	13 ^{34f.}	23 ³⁷⁻³⁹
L. Church discipline	17 ¹⁻⁶	18 ^{6f. 15. 21f.} 17 ²⁰
M. The Q Apocalypse	17 ²²⁻³⁷	24

It is clear that the latter part of the list furnishes no argument in favour of a single common source

¹ Omitting the L saying (11^{27f.}) about the mother of Jesus.

of Matthew and Luke on the grounds of common order. There is no such common order. But the case is different at the beginning of the list; for here the sections A B C D F G follow one another in the same order in both Matthew and Luke. The hypothesis is admittedly tenable (as far as evidence derived from order alone is concerned) that the reason why Matthew and Luke present these sections in the same order is that they derived them from the same written source. There is however another hypothesis which satisfies the requirements of the data without postulating any unknown quantity; and an explanation which explains without making further assumptions is to be preferred to one which in solving one problem creates another. It will be observed that the order of the sections A B C F G is not only the same in both Matthew and Luke; it also corresponds with the outline of Mark. Mark too begins his Gospel with an account of John and his work (A). Next follows the brief Marcan temptation narrative (B).² Both Matthew and Luke insert their different forms of the Q sermon (C) at points where a body of teaching is implied by the Marcan narrative (Mt 1^{38f.} 3⁷⁻¹²). There is no warrant in Mark for the connexion of C and D; accordingly we should suppose that this connexion was a piece of tradition (perhaps written tradition) common to Matthew and Luke. F is given its place in Matthew and Luke by the Marcan report of the appointment and sending out of the Twelve; after which follows, in Mark as in Q, an account of the Beelzebul controversy (G). It is noteworthy that as soon as Matthew and Luke step off firm Marcan ground, in section H, they at once begin to diverge from one another.

The argument, then, that the order of the Q sections in Matthew and Luke indicates that they were drawn from a common document, breaks down.

The results of this investigation are admittedly negative. It has appeared probable that behind Q we should see a wider editorial research and a greater number of sources than have commonly been allowed for; but we have taken no steps to analyse Q and consider its constituent elements. These are, however, tasks which lie ahead of Synoptic critics, and they promise a field of singular interest because it is one in which the two rewarding disciplines of Form-criticism and Source-criticism may be pursued side by side.

² The argument admits of simple adaptation if it be held that Lk 3^{1-4³⁰} is 'Proto-Luke' and does not depend on Mark at all.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Green Fingers.

BY THE REVEREND HAROLD DERBYSHIRE,
HARROGATE.

'Behold my hands.'—Jn 20²⁷.

A GREAT many of the prizes at the garden show were carried off by Mr. Brown. Some of the other competitors were looking at his exhibits, and discussing the reasons for his success. 'Oh,' said one man at last, 'he has green fingers.'

Now Mr. Brown's hands did not look very different from yours or mine, except that perhaps they were a little harder and rougher. Certainly there was no green stain about them. But (as you will know already if you have spent much time in the company of gardeners) that was not what the man meant. To have 'green fingers' means, in gardening language, that a man has a knack of persuading plants to grow as they should. His garden may have the same sort of soil as his neighbours', he may buy the same seeds, use similar fertilizers, and yet the quality of the flowers and vegetables he grows will surpass theirs by far. 'His plants never go wrong,' they say, with a certain feeling of envy.

I am not going to try to explain why a man has 'green fingers,' because I don't know. There is what the French call a certain *je ne sais quoi* about Mr. Brown's gardening. But some people seem to have a way of handling plants which causes them to grow better than those of others. It is as if the plants knew who was touching them, and knew it was somebody who loved them. I once had a neighbour who would transplant every cabbage seedling from his nursery bed to the kitchen garden with infinite care, and I have heard him say, as he finished the work, 'There! They won't know they have been moved.' The plants might have been children being tucked up in bed!

We know how it is with ourselves—how the right sort of touch sometimes makes such a difference. When the doctor came to see you that time you were feeling so 'down in the mouth,' his hands, gentle, yet so strong and skilful, made you know that you were in *safe* hands, and that you were going to be all right. And you remember the night when you were feverish, and couldn't go to sleep, until a hand on your brow, cool, soothing, restful—it was your mother's—sent you off into refreshing slumber.

When Helen Keller, at the age of two, became blind and deaf, two doors of understanding were shut. How was she to know the world and to know people, without hearing and sight? There was only one way—through the sense of touch. That sense had to be trained by a teacher whose own hands were able to pass on knowledge, and something more than knowledge. Helen Keller

has described how she first met Miss Sullivan. 'I stretched out my hand . . . some one took it, and I was caught up and held close in the arms of her who had come to reveal all things to me, and, more than all things else, to love me.'

The writers of the Gospels have a great deal to say about the touch of Jesus. It bestowed blessing; it was full of healing power. 'They brought young children unto him, that he should touch them.' 'They besought him to touch the blind man.' 'He touched her hand, and the fever left her.' The touch of Jesus healed and blessed because the love of God was in it. It made people believe in God, and know that He was their loving Father, and that made them strong and well again. And at the last, also, His hands were scarred with love's sacrifice, and that, more than anything else, brought men into touch with God.

I said a minute ago that I could not explain 'green fingers,' but I have an idea that love has a lot to do with it. Dean Hole, in his *Book About Roses*, says, 'He who would have beautiful Roses in his garden must have beautiful Roses in his heart. He must love them well and always.'

And if you and I are going to help people, as Jesus did, we must let His wonderful love dwell in us and work through us.

Peter Pan's Motto.

BY THE REVEREND WILLIAM J. MAY, NUNEATON.

It is a very interesting fact that some of the people who have never lived, except in some one's imagination, like Alice, who went to Wonderland, and Anne, who lived in Green Gables, and Ivanhoe, and Oliver Twist, are much more real and alive than most of the people who have really lived. One of those invented people who is known to every boy and girl is Peter Pan. Of course, he never really lived as you live, but a clever man said the other day that Peter Pan walked the rolling roads of England for centuries before Barrie caught him and put him in a book. And you will remember that Peter Pan had a very fine motto—'Turn to the right and keep straight on till morning.' That is a motto worth remembering and worth copying. Shall we try to see what it means?

Turn to the right does not mean just turning to the right hand but turning to the right way. That is the really important thing, and one thing which we have to remember is that no one was ever sorry for turning to the right way. People have often been sorry because they did not turn to the right way. One wonderful day Jesus met Saul of Tarsus down the Damascus road and Saul asked, 'Lord, what dost thou wish me to do?' and received, in effect, the answer, 'Turn to the right and keep straight on till morning.' In the after days, when Paul told that story, he used to

add, 'I did as I was commanded. I was not disobedient to the heavenly vision.'

The world is full of splendid stories of men and women who heard the same command and who obeyed in the same fashion. Anthony Ashley, who was later to become Earl of Shaftesbury, heard that command while he was still a boy at Eton, and vowed that he would spend his life in helping poor people. Later on, he came again to the cross roads. He was asked to champion the cause of the children who worked cruelly long hours in the factories, and he scarcely knew which way to take. On the one side he would have hosts of friends, a pleasant, easy life; on the other hand he would lose his friends, have a lifetime of worry and care and no ease. He asked his wife what he should do. 'Turn to the right and keep straight on,' she said. 'It is your duty, and the consequences we must leave. Go forward, and to victory!' So Earl Shaftesbury spent the rest of his days helping the children and the poor and needy.

But not all those who turn to the right keep on to the end of the road. Peter turned aside from that road when he denied Jesus in the judgment hall, and he was never able to forgive himself afterwards. John Mark turned back, and deserted Paul and Barnabas when the road ahead threatened to be too dangerous and he was always sorry afterwards, but he turned round and got on to the right road again and kept on till morning. If you have read *The Pilgrim's Progress* you know how often Christian was tempted to turn back, after he had turned to the right. Remember the lions on Hill Difficulty and the fight with Apollyon in the Valley of Humiliation, for example. But he kept on and came to the Celestial City in the morning.

Some scientists say that copper is matter that was on the way to becoming gold but took a wrong turning and ended up as copper when, if it had kept on the right road it would have been gold. How much was lost by not keeping on. But if we do keep on we shall see the morning break. 'The path of the just is as the shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day.' Will you make Peter Pan's motto your own. 'Turn to the right, the right way, and keep straight on till morning.'

The Christian Year.

TWELFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Man Under Authority.

BY THE REVEREND E. L. ALLEN, M.A., PH.D.,
UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM.

'I also am a man under authority, having under myself soldiers: and I say to this one, Go, and he goeth; and to another, Come, and he cometh; and to my servant, Do this, and he doeth it.'—Mt 8⁹ (R.V.).

The centurion in this story was not a Roman, but a warrant-officer, as we should call him, in the levies of the Galilean government; though it

would be natural to suppose that the Herods organized their forces on the Imperial model. He is the delegate of one greater than himself, and such power as he holds is due entirely to the fact that he is an intermediary; as the King's representative, he can require of others an obedience which they would refuse to give if he asked for it in his own name. Just because he has subordinated his own purposes to those of the King, he can legitimately demand in turn that others should subordinate their purposes to his.

It is just this position which he occupies which enables him to pierce the secret of Jesus, so that Jesus receives him with approval, as one whose insight surpasses any He has yet met with. For he sees that Jesus in a sense stands where he does, that He also is an intermediary, and that His powers are so great only because He holds them as the delegate of Another. The centurion thinks of the unseen as peopled with spirit-forces, and he does not doubt that Jesus has undisputed command over these; He is over them, because He is under authority to God. Jesus accepts without hesitation that account of Himself, and nowhere do we find it more fully confirmed than in the Fourth Gospel. There Jesus says: 'I am come down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.' And again, if we want still stronger language: 'The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father doing.'

Now, what is true of this centurion and of our Lord is also characteristic of man in this world: his greatness lies in the fact that he is in the world by God's appointment and under God's authority. On the very first page of the Bible we read how God created man and set him over creation as His vicegerent, ordaining that he should have dominion over Nature on the sole condition that he acknowledge himself to be under God. Man's happiness, freedom, and security are bound up with his acceptance of this intermediary position; the world is beneath him because God is above him. The great error of Western man is that he has established his mastery over Nature while disowning the sovereignty of God; that has brought upon him confusion and slaughter. Hence he needs to learn afresh this all-important truth, that God means him neither to cringe before the world in fear nor to abuse it in arrogance, but to enjoy and use it as a trust from God.

For centuries now a change has been coming over our civilization, and in the last fifty years it has gone forward at a rapid pace—the decay of a sense of the authority of God. I was once walking through a country district in South China with a shrewd Chinese farmer: we were talking about the war-lord who had just taken possession of the district. He was little more than a bandit who had seized power, and my friend said of him: 'Ah, his heart has no master!' The world to-day is in danger of being delivered over to men whose hearts have no master. There is such a thing, too, as resentment abroad in our society, resentment against what curbs our impulses or rebukes our

pride, against what would lay an obligation upon us or hinder us from doing exactly as we want. Perhaps in no other people is this so strong as among the Spaniards: hence the civil wars that in Spain and South America alike have made up so much of the history of the last hundred years. Little wonder, therefore, that it was a Spaniard who uttered the prophecy years ago: 'Before long there will be heard throughout the planet a formidable cry, rising like the howling of innumerable dogs to the stars, asking for some one or something to take command, to impose an obligation, a duty.'

In the light of what has happened since, we can see better what that prophecy meant. Man cannot live except under some authority; if, therefore, he is no longer willing to accept God's authority, he must manufacture another in its place. In the ancient world that was easy enough: a man simply took a piece of wood, hacked and cut it into human shape, set it on a pedestal and swore fealty to it. It is just as easy in the modern world: you take a man of flesh and blood like yourself, set him on a pedestal, deck him out with a title, and swear fealty to him. In our own country we have not gone as far as that, but we have other substitutes. One person makes a fetish of science, another swallows the Marxist dogma wholesale, a third goes over, lock, stock, and barrel, to some new religious cult. Yes, the choice before us is not between being free and having God for our Master; it is between being free by having God for our Master and allowing ourselves to be enslaved by a human tyranny of some kind.

But if that is so, why then do men rebel against God? Part of the answer is that we who stand for God have so sadly misrepresented His authority that it has seemed to people that, to preserve their manhood, they must repudiate it. We have spoken of God as though He were the Dictator of the universe, driving men by threats of punishment in this world or the next to believe certain propositions and to perform certain actions. Men were right to reject such a demand. But the recognition of God does not mean the surrender of reason and conscience; rather does it mean the opportunity for their full employment. To belong to God is not to be tied hand and foot; it is to have room to move in, and to be able at last to exercise one's powers.

It is the false authorities which employ coercion; the authority of God is grounded in wisdom and love. In wisdom, because God made the world, made, too, this marvel of human life, so sensitive and uncertain, so capable both of good and of ill, and He therefore knows how it should be used. He is infinite, too, in His resources, so that what seems to us unyielding fate is plastic in His hands, and He can show us how to bend and shape it to His will. His authority is that of love, a love which yearns over us and is infinitely patient with us, which believes in us in spite of everything, and wants nothing but our true and abiding good. Such an authority men cannot in the end resist, though they may hold out against it for a while:

they were made for it, and in their heart of hearts there is nothing else which they desire so much.

I have spoken so far in abstract terms of man and his status in the universe. Let me apply these thoughts now to ourselves, and let me use for that purpose the military language with which we are so familiar to-day. You, my friend, are not a mere conscript, called up, put into uniform, drilled, and told just what you must do. You are an officer, you hold the King's commission and you have a share in His authority. He has not given you detailed orders as to what you are to do; He has bound you to Himself in loyalty and leaves you to use your intelligence and conscience in the doing of His will. Confront your circumstances with courage; as you acknowledge that you are in them as one under God's authority, you will be able to rise above them. For life is given you that it may swing ever between two high moments; in this you bow humbly before God, and in that you stand erect and fearless before men.

THIRTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Spiritual Insight.

BY THE REVEREND R. J. WEDDERSPOON, M.A.,
POLLOKSHIELDS, GLASGOW.

'So they ran both together: and the other disciple did outrun Peter, and came first to the sepulchre.'—
Jn 20⁴.

It might have been expected that the first to reach the sepulchre would have been Peter. As we recollect Peter's well-known impulsiveness, his headlong and precipitate impetuosity, we have the feeling that it would have been entirely in keeping with what we know of his character if the record informed us that he was easily first in this dramatic race to the tomb where the body of Jesus had been buried.

But no! 'The other disciple did outrun Peter.' It was John who got there first.

This race through the streets of Jerusalem when the darkness of a spring morning was just beginning to yield to the dawn is, on many counts, surprising enough. Of all the crowded events that Jerusalem has witnessed in its long story there is possibly none that is stamped with the same tense, dramatic quality which this incident possesses. It was the Resurrection morning, and though the Resurrection of our Lord was an event withdrawn from mortal sight, quiet as the coming of the dawn itself, its immediate repercussions were swift and spectacular. While it was yet dark, Mary had stolen her way to the sepulchre, and not even the blanket of darkness could conceal from her the fact that the stone that sealed the sepulchre had been rolled away. In a mood of high excitement she ran back to the house where Peter and John were to be found, and it was not long until their excitement mounted to meet hers. Sensing that something most remarkable was afoot, they could not reach the tomb quickly enough. In the thin, gray light of the morning

they hurried on. They broke into a run, and it is surely not fanciful to imagine them as they arrived at the tomb itself, both panting and breathless, and with John ahead of Peter.

Why does Scripture record this fact? Need the writer have bothered to tell us this particular detail? Has it any significance for us? Does it matter in the slightest which of the two apostles was the first to reach the tomb?

Well, in the first place, we are given a necessary reminder that in matters of religion we ought always to exhibit a sense of eager expectancy.

At the very thought that Christ might be risen, and coming back to them in power, John and Peter determined that they could not reach the tomb quickly enough. They ran as fast as their legs could carry them. The most disquieting feature of the diminished church attendances of to-day is the revelation therein made that many people have no interest in possibly meeting the Risen Christ. With regard to that, they are quite apathetic. It does not seem to occur to them that on the first day of each week, when we celebrate the Resurrection anew, something might occur to change the whole current of their lives. They will engage gladly in almost any other kind of race, for money, for fame, for pleasure. But the only race that is worth winning, where Christ Himself is the prize at the end, interests them not at all. Even in war-time there are those who are continually jostling each other in order to be first to secure the biggest money prizes.

But let us be frank with ourselves. How many of us habitually come to church in an attitude of tense and believing expectancy? How many of us expect a direct encounter with Christ? On a Sunday morning ought we not to feel that we cannot get to church quickly enough because He is going to be there, waiting for us? It is to be feared that sometimes we come to worship surrendering only to the stern compulsion of a dreary duty, and exhibiting little of that apostolic eagerness that quickened into an enthusiasm not to be denied, even although the Resurrection was then only a marginal possibility.

It is to be noted, secondly, that it is not always the person you would expect who reaches the understanding of Christ first.

In this case we should have thought that the quiet, contemplative, mystical John, as we so often picture him, would be easily outstripped by a natural leader like Peter. Is there not, therefore, a suggestion here that in matters of faith we may expect the unlikely person to have something worth while to tell us?

When Laurence Binyon died recently, we all recalled that he was the writer of those famous lines, *For the Fallen*, which are generally agreed to be, for their purpose, incomparable. But if you had been asked to say which of our then living poets at the end of the last war would be most likely to produce the adequate and final commentary, would you have suggested Laurence Binyon? A much more likely name to suggest would have been that of Kipling, the poet of Empire, of *Lest We Forget*, the poet who lost his

only son in the war. But Binyon outran Kipling, a fact which Kipling himself was the first to admit. Lady Hall tells that Binyon was staying with her in the summer of 1920 when Kipling was unexpectedly announced. The two men had never met before. On hearing Binyon's name, Mr. Kipling did not speak, but took him immediately away to a remote part of the garden. 'We could see that Kipling was suffering from great emotion. It was a hallowed moment for the great man of letters who had lost his only son in the war to be brought face to face with the poet whose lines, *For The Fallen*, he thought the most beautiful expression of sorrow in the English language.' Yes, the other disciple often outruns Peter. The supreme insight is often given to those whom we would ourselves never name as likely to possess it.

And now we reach the chief suggestion this incident enforces. Spiritual insight generally reaches to the heart of Christian truth and Christian experience before all else. John gets 'furthest ben.' The other disciple outruns all the Peters.

We have little time for the reading of devotional literature in these days, but surely the study of our devotional classics gives us a better understanding of the real heart of the Christian religion than all the volumes of apologetics ever written. John Bunyan and John Woolman, Christina Rossetti and Samuel Rutherford, these and others like them always come first to the understanding of Christ. They cannot be bettered, and they cannot be overthrown.

In an age like our own, which is inclined to accord to the utterances of famous names on the subject of religion a respect greater than they deserve, we do well to remember that a God-fearing widow, living in a back street, who has lived long and seen much, is a witness to the power of Christ not easily to be discounted. The true apostolic succession, says Dean Inge, is to be found in the lives of the saints.

In his great book on Sir Walter Scott, John Buchan has a passage, in which he says, speaking of Scott's 'consecrating power,' that some few have made the poor lovable and significant, but that Scott alone has lifted them to the sublime. 'It is not the kings and captains who most eloquently preach love of country, but Edie Ochiltree the beggar, who has no belongings but a blue gown and a wallet. It is not a queen or great lady who lays down the profoundest laws of conduct, but Jeanie Deans, the peasant girl. It is Bessie Maclure, a lone widow among the hills, who in the Covenant strife has the vision of peace through wider charity.'

We live in a world that seems to be dominated increasingly by men of practical affairs, and by voices that are more often strident than instructive. Is it not time that we strove to remember that the unnumbered quiet in the land have a mission to fulfil, and a task to perform that we do well to respect? In every congregation there is John's successor, who realizes the ultimate secret first, and, in the only contest that matters, gains the prize. Can we not endeavour to develop

our own spiritual insight, and take our place in the worthiest of all successions? God grant that we may!

FOURTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Harvest Loaves.

BY THE REVEREND T. A. BAMPTON, FROME,
SOMERSET.

'He saith unto them, How many loaves have ye? go and see.'—Mk 6⁸⁸.

It is one of the miracles of this time of war that the nation has been fed so well. One man is not likely to lose his reputation, although we may safely predict that there will be some who will find themselves less popular at the end of the war than at its beginning. Men lose reputations at a time such as this as easily and mysteriously as they lose their studs in the morning. The man who is likely to come out unscathed is Lord Woolton.

There are people who would dismiss the story of the Feeding of the Five Thousand as just another bit of religious exaggeration. They weigh the five loaves and the two fishes in the scales, and then work out by arithmetical calculation that, according to Meiklejohn, the division would be about one eighth of a crumb apiece. There are people who leave God out of His universe like that. They calculate minus God, as if man were his own author and supporter. If we are in any measure to understand life, we must include God in our calculations.

We reap the harvest. Whose harvest is it? It is in no sense ours. We can make tanks and Tommy guns, but we cannot make a single ear of wheat. It takes God to grow an apple, and all we can do is to eat it in thankfulness. If, for instance, God pondered thus: 'These children of Mine that are on the planet Earth seem able to get along very well without Me; I will leave them to themselves for a year or two. I will take the principle of life from every plant and herb and tree. I will let them fend for themselves without My aid;' how would man be able to take the place of God in the provision for his physical needs? One could imagine some observer on another planet—if the other planets are inhabited—looking out on a starry night, and saying to his son, 'My son, you see that disk in the sky that reflects the sun so palely? That is the Earth. It used to be inhabited by teeming millions of beings something like ourselves. It is now a dead moon, and all our scientific observation has failed to discover a single evidence of life on it. It is dead and cold and done for, just a bubble of dry dust whirling round, with nothing left but its pitiable momentum.'

Jesus is not a conjurer bringing loaves and fishes from nowhere before the astonished gaze of a company of credulous Jews. He is God manifest in human life. The greater miracle would have been if He had failed to feed the hungry multitude, being what and who He was. If Jesus had been

a mere magician, He would have been forgotten after a few years; but Jesus is still the One Great Force to be reckoned with in the world to-day. If Lord Woolton, by a masterpiece of organization, can feed over forty millions of people, it is not so difficult to believe that a Greater than he could feed five thousand in the desert place long ago. Your attitude to this and other miracles of our Lord is dependent upon your answer to the question which Jesus put to His disciples, 'But whom say ye that I am?'

The question concerning the loaves comes as the command of Christ to us to review our own resources. We must, like the disciples, bestir ourselves to do a little counting. Then God comes in with His Divine multiplication. Both the resources and the multiplication of them originate in the grace of God in creation and redemption. This story is an illustration of God's use of man's endowment.

1. When Christ touches our need He does not supply out of any special bounty. He uses what we already have in hand. 'How many loaves have ye?' He asks. What the Incarnation brought to the world of mankind was not additional resources, but the power to use in God's way the original endowment of life. Contact with Christ brings out in human experience powers undreamt of. He reveals to us that our selfish and self-centred provision, if used in His way, will help to feed the starving soul of the world.

There is no suggestion that the disciples were selfish or thoughtless in having five loaves and two fishes for their own lunch. In the ordinary course of the day Jesus would have shared the meal with them, meagre though it was for a company of grown men. But Christ points out the better way. The legitimate provision made by the disciples is increased to serve the community, not to increase their store. Thus what the little company first intended for its own needs, in the hands of Christ becomes the sustenance of many.

2. The natural resources of man are very great. His powers of mind, his ingenuity and inventiveness, have added considerably to his survival values. Malthus asserted that population would soon get ahead of the harvest, and mankind would discover there were too many mouths to fill. Science has removed the possibility of want to an indefinitely remote date. Necessity has been the mother of man's intensive cultivation of the soil, and suburbia echoes with the question, 'How does your garden grow?' All this is but a parable of the richness of the endowment of personality with which man has been blessed.

The will is free;

Strong is the soul, and wise, and beautiful;
The seeds of godlike power are in us still;
Gods are we, bards, saints, heroes, if we will.

The tragedy is that so many go from the cradle to the grave, and bury the riches of their personality without using them. They have the loaves and fishes, but they have never handed them over to Christ to bless and break and give to the multitude. The selfish misuse of the rich provision for man's

needs is the major sorrow in the heart of God which brought Christ to the Cross.

3. The use to which Christ puts the gifts which are consecrated to Him is still a greater miracle than the Feeding of the Five Thousand. Christ fulfils His promise to His disciples, 'Greater works than these shall ye do.' A frail mill-girl like Mary Slessor or a factory hand like Livingstone hands over the lunch basket, and in the blessing and breaking their meagre resources become the food of thousands. Francis of Assisi, Grenfell, Spurgeon, Booth, and Barnett all handed over. They answered the question of Christ, 'How many loaves have ye?' They offered what they had. They could offer no more; they would offer no less. It is said that Spurgeon had a beautiful speaking voice, as clear as a bell, with a range capable of filling the largest auditorium. Of course he could have kept it for his own use, and probably have amassed a fortune; or have neglected to use it at all, and have died unknown. The story is different. He brought it to Christ, and the world knows the rest.

4. Many never realize what they possess in the way of natural endowment until they come to Christ. The loaves go mouldy in the knapsack of their heart, and neither they nor the multitude are fed. Or men cast their bread upon the waters of worldly ambition, and it does not return, even after many days. The world has a way of taking without acknowledging or attempting to repay. But when Christ takes, and blesses, there is always more at the end than there was at the beginning. Twelve baskets full remained. No man ever loses who hands over his powers and endowments to Christ. The law of increasing returns is the law of His love. No man can grow without sacrificial giving in whole-hearted community service. Life is impoverished in the ratio of our withholdings and enriched by the prodigality of our giving. The test question for us all is 'How many loaves have ye?'

FIFTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Great Invitation.

BY THE REVEREND STEWART MECHIE, M.A.,
EDINBURGH.

'Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.'—Mt 11²⁸.

Remember how this text has appealed to different types of men. A conversation is recorded between Walter Pater and a friend, in which the latter suggested that the orthodox Christian faith would not last very much longer. 'I do not agree with you,' said Pater. 'You think that the Christian religion is all plain. But I cannot. There are mysteries in it. Take that saying, "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden." There is a mystery in that.' Again, a friend of the saintly Percy Ainsworth has recalled how he would sometimes fall into a reverie, and when he came out of it his very voice was changed, as if he had returned from a long holiday in

bracing air. One day, after one of these silences, his friend asked, 'Where have you been, Percy?' and, on receiving an answer in the form of the question, 'What do you think is the greatest text in the Bible?', replied, 'Come unto me.' Whereupon Percy Ainsworth said, 'That's where I've been.' Truly this is a rich text with a wide and deep appeal.

1. Notice who are addressed here—all who are labouring and burdened. In the first instance that meant people whose religion had become a burden to them. 'They bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne upon men's shoulders,' said our Lord of the religious teachers of the day. That was a characteristic fault of contemporary Judaism; but the same type of religion is apt to crop up even under Christian auspices. When George Eliot's *Life* was published and all the world learned with what apparent suddenness and ease she had cast off her early religious faith, R. H. Hutton of *The Spectator* shrewdly remarked, 'To me the remarkable point is that George Eliot felt herself relieved of a burden rather than robbed of a great spiritual mainstay by the change.' True religion is not something that men carry, but something that carries them. If it is a burden at all, it is the kind of burden that wings are to a bird or engines to an aeroplane—something that may add to the weight, but something that adds vastly more to the lift and the power.

Moreover, there is a burden more common than that of a legalistic religion—the burden of a bad conscience. We may be sure that our Lord, with His matchless insight into human need, had this burden, too, in mind when He spoke this gracious invitation. One thinks of the woman of the city in Simon the Pharisee's house and of Zacchæus and of Peter after his denial. The glorious truth that is made clear in such cases is that He not only met the weary burdened souls and spoke the words of forgiveness and hope, but that He brought these words home to them and made forgiveness credible to them, really imparting to them all that His words signified.

Perhaps there is a burden commoner still, and that is just the burden of life itself with its cares and conflicts, its drudgeries and disappointments, its frustrations and failures, its empty successes and bitter sorrows, and with its unknown but menacing uncertainties. No doubt that burden is partly of our own making. In our ignorance and folly we aim at the wrong things, we become vexed over things that do not much matter, and so life becomes more weary than it was ever meant to be. Yet when all allowance is made, it is still true that life remains a burden for all, though some are much more aware of their inadequacy for it than others, and our Lord would not be the universal Saviour unless He could say to those who falter under it, 'Come unto Me, ye labouring and burdened ones.'

2. Notice what is promised to such labouring and burdened folk. 'I will give you rest.' It is important, however, to remember that the Greek word translated 'rest' has the suggestion of a respite or temporary rest in preparation for future

toil. It is not the rest of the aged, disabled, superannuated worker who is never to work again, but the refreshing rest of the weary but still active worker about to gird himself in due course for a new day's tasks. Hence some modern translators are justified in rendering this promise as 'I will refresh you.' What is in view is rather refreshment than rest, and that is so because, though the grievous burden is gone, there is still a burden. Look at the verses that follow our text. 'My burden,' says our Lord, 'is light. My yoke is easy. Take my yoke upon you.' What He promises is not the abolition of all burdens, but a change of burden. Instead of the heavy crushing burden there is to be a burden that is light, and instead of the grievous galling yoke there is to be a yoke that is kindly. Such is the rest that He offers to the weary.

3. Notice what is required of those who would accept the promised gift of rest. 'Come unto me,' He says, and that is amplified in the verses that follow—'Take my yoke upon you and learn of me.' But how does one come to Him? There is something original and unique in every soul and therefore in every soul's coming to Him; but, as the late Principal Denney once wrote with this very question in view—'The one certainty in every case is that we come to Jesus in some kind of obedience, in an act rather than a belief, or in a belief which has no adequate expression except in act. . . . No intellectual difficulties are ever supposed in the Gospel, for there are no intellectual requirements. But there is always something to do or to bear. What it is, we must find out for ourselves in Jesus' presence.' These are wise and searching words. Read your New Testament with

attention after preparatory prayer, bow before Him who speaks to you from its pages, and it will be strange if you do not hear Him say something to you about 'something to do or to bear.' Listen and obey. That is the way to come to Him. Sometimes it may be difficult to be sure of what He is saying; but, as a rule, the difficulty is not to know what He says but to face up to the 'something to do or to bear.' His yoke is kindly and His burden is light, but the taking up of them is sometimes hard, a veritable crucifixion. His invitation is abundantly gracious, but sometimes men are so entangled in false values that they dare not, at all events they will not, come unto Him. He challenges each one with something to do or to bear, but that challenge is like the breakers near the shore to the swimmer. If he will persist and fight his way through he will find beyond the peace and strength of the ocean. The true way is not to go back and refuse the challenge of the breakers but to go deeper in. So when men accept Christ's challenge of something to do or to bear—though it may seem like a crucifixion at the time—divine powers undertake for them. They come to Him and receive what He has promised. His rest is not to be had at any less a price.

So, whatever be the form of your weariness, whether it be a burdensome religion, a load of guilt, or just life itself with what it contains for you, the gracious promise of real rest is addressed to you. Will you not listen in the silences of this sacred hour for that something to do or to bear which, for you, is what it means to come to Him? Will you not listen and obey, cost what it may? Thus indeed you will come to Him and claim and receive His promised rest.

Contributions and Comments.

Baptism for the Dead.

APART from this particular verse (1 Co 15²⁹) there seems to be no trace of any such usage. I suggest that the whole difficulty arises from a misplacing of the stops. Read:

Ἐπεὶ (in that case) τί ποιήσουσιν οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι; (what are the baptized to do? The use of the future indicative for subjunctive can be paralleled.) Ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν εἰ ὅλως νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται (if the resurrection of the dead is completely ruled out, they are merely baptized into death) Τί καὶ βαπτίζονται ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν; (and whatever is the use of that?)

For a similar misplacing of stops, cf. Jn 7^{27, 38}, which should run 'Εάν τις διψᾷ ἐρχέσθω πρὸς με, καὶ πινέτω ὁ ποτεύων εἰς ἐμέ, and for St. Paul's knowledge of Greek, Rutherford, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, p. xvii.

I owe this suggestion to Sir Robert Anderson, but cannot now give the reference.

F. J. BADCOCK.

Brecon.

The Passover.

IN an article in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for June 1942, I was at some pains to show that the narrative of events connected with the last Passover of our Lord's life as given by the Synoptists, properly translated, was in accord with the niceties of Passover observance in its different stages. Incidentally there was involved the question of the time of beginning of the Jewish day; and I tried to show that for most purposes, like the old Israelite day, it might be considered to begin at daybreak, rather than in the evening. In this connexion a note of the famous Mishnaic commentator, Obadiah of Bertinoro, on Pes 4⁵, is of special interest. The text of the Mishna says, with respect to work on the eve of the Passover: 'In what concerns the night, the school of Shammai forbid [any work], but the school of Hillel permit it until sunrise'; on which R. O. de B. comments thus: 'Schola Schamai vetat, uti omnibus reliquis diebus festis quibus operari interdictum est, quia nox diem sequitur. Schola Hillelis

permittit, uti in diebus jejunii, ubi de die vetitum est comedere nocte vero licitum.' From this it appears that, while fasts are on a different footing, restrictions for the night would normally follow those of the *preceding* day; while the text of the Mishna itself puts sunrise as marking the beginning of a new period. This is of the more interest that the schools of Shammai and Hillel were flourishing in the first century A.D.

The question of the time when a new day begins might seem quite trivial, but it assumes importance, because the view taken by an author on this point has been regarded as a touchstone for judging of his real acquaintance with Jewish customs. Thus Burkitt, in a long but not very convincing article on *ἐπιφώσκειν* (*J.T.S.* xiv. 538, etc.) hints that it tells against Luke's credit as a historian that, in some passages of Acts, even more clearly than in his Gospel, he seems to begin his days in the morning or at cock-crow; while even Matthew does not use the 'strict Jewish day.' The whole question deserves further elucidation, but I have brought forward some evidence to show that Luke's way of starting a new day is not altogether a mistake.

PERCY J. HEAWOOD.

Durham.

Denying Oneself.

THE R.V. marginal note on Jn 21¹⁷ 'Peter was grieved because he said unto him the third time, Lovest thou me?' refers us to 13³⁸ '... till thou hast denied me thrice.' The grief is because the demand for a threefold affirmation recalls his threefold denial. To examine the two contexts is to be left in no doubt of their interrelation in the purpose of the writer. He meant that Jn 21 should turn us back to Jn 13. There occur, in reverse

order, the same three ideas, (1) Denying, (2) the Cross, (3) Following.

Jn 13³⁶⁻³⁸.

(3) Thou canst not follow me now.

(2) Thou shalt follow afterwards (foretells Peter's own crucifixion).

(1) The cock shall not crow, till thou hast denied me thrice.

Jn 21¹⁵⁻¹⁹.

(1) Peter was grieved because he said unto him the third time... (refers back to the denial; the threefold affirmation cancels it out).

(2) Thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee... Now this he spake, signifying by what death he should glorify God.

(3) Follow me.

I suggest that it is also the purpose of the writer that his readers should recall one of the best known sayings of our Lord, Mk 8³⁴:

'He called unto him the multitude with his disciples, and said unto them, If any man would come after me, let him (1) deny himself, and (2) take up his cross, and (3) follow me.'

'Denying oneself' has become part of our accepted vocabulary. When our Lord used it, it was a startling phrase. The association of the above three passages serves to remind us that to affirm love for the Lord is the equivalent of denying oneself. And self-denial means, not merely 'doing without things' as in the dilution of popular use, but 'disowning self.' It means saying of self what St. Peter once said of his Lord, 'I know not this man.' It means saying with St. Paul, 'I live, and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me.'

JOHN FOSTER.

Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham.

Entre Nous.

Vernon Faithfull Storr.

It is not often that parents are so happily inspired in naming their children as the parents of Vernon Storr were, for, if I may use a vulgar colloquialism, 'Faithful was his middle name.' One of his friends said of him: 'He was not a scholar of the calibre of Armitage Robinson or of Charles; he was not a preacher of the celebrity of Gore or Hensley Henson; he was not a philanthropist and man of business like Barnett, nor again was he a man of letters like Kingsley or Beeching; and yet his quiet influence permeated Westminster to an extent of which he was probably himself entirely unaware.' And another friend said of him that 'he formed one of that long line of saintly pastors, like George Herbert and Bishop

Wilson, which has ever been one of the special glories of the Church of England.'

It would be a mistake, however, to think of Storr only as a saint. He was an extremely able philosophical thinker; he was a tutor in philosophy at Oxford; and one gains a very real respect for his intellect from some of the extracts from his published theological works given in his biography—*Vernon Faithfull Storr: A Memoir*, by the Rev. G. H. Harris (S.P.C.K.; 7s. 6d. net). For many years he wrote the Saturday religious article in *The Times*; he was a member of the Archbishop's Commission on doctrine, examining chaplain to Archbishop Davidson, Warburton Lecturer to Lincoln's Inn, and one of the editors of, and a considerable contributor to, the 'Little Bible' (teachers owe him a great debt for this).

He twice refused a bishopric, once a desirable deanery, and also the Regius Professorship of Divinity in succession to Dr. Headlam. He wrote over twenty theological works, some of them of permanent value.

The most interesting fact about Storr, however, was that he was the founder and head of a middle movement in the religious world, that of Liberal Evangelicalism. There are some men whose cast of mind leads them inevitably into a particular school of thought. Gore was one of these. He was a Catholic, he said, by 'mental constitution.' 'I remember very well,' he continued, 'when I was eight or nine reading a book by a Protestant author—a Presbyterian, I think—entitled *Father Clement*, about the conversion of a Catholic priest to Protestantism. I have never read it since. I had been brought up in ordinary old-fashioned English Church ways. I had only attended very Low Church services. I had never heard of the Oxford Movement. I knew nothing about Catholicism, except as a strange superstition, called Popery. But the book described confession and absolution, fasting, the Real Presence, the devotion of the Three Hours, the use of incense, etc., and I felt instinctively and at once, that this sort of sacramental religion was the religion for me.' That is the stuff of which extremists are made. Storr was different. His position was the result of conviction alone.

It was, as I have said, a middle way, and I am reminded of a valuable saying of Robertson of Brighton that the truth is never to be found between two extremes but by the half-truths in each of the extremes being brought together. Storr's way was a middle way not in the sense of being neither one thing nor the other, but in the sense that he wished to preserve the truth in both and hold them together. He was a Modernist and he was also an Evangelical. To many Modernists and to many Evangelicals that sounds a contradiction. To Storr each of the two terms was truth, and he had a prophetic assurance that there would yet be a reconciliation between Modernism and Evangelicalism. To the day of his death Storr was an official of the Modern Church Union, but he never lost his really passionate faith in the Christian fundamentals.

The Liberal Evangelical had two great principles. One was freedom. He was ready to welcome new knowledge from whatever quarter it came. Theology for him is a growing and progressive science. Hence one age cannot impose its theological beliefs upon its successor. And therefore the maximum of liberty should be conceded. Indeed, Storr said, the battle for freedom has been largely won. The second ruling principle for the Liberal Evangelical is that the supreme authority is the Mind of Christ. He will make this his standard in testing developments in theology or ecclesiastical organization, thus going back to the creative source of Christianity. But the Liberal Evangelical holds that the Mind of Christ was larger than some of the interpretations that have been given of it. But at any rate here is a test which we can apply to the problems of our age:

Is this or that something of which Christ would approve? We must, for example, test schemes of reunion by this standard, and schemes of economic or social reform. This may seem a vague test, but it is not so. It is something that will preserve the temper of open-mindedness and at the same time give clear guidance and definite conviction.

This was the reconciling position that Storr occupied, and it is the real significance of his life for our time. It was his contribution to the living religion of his church and age. It seems to me a desirable and reasonable path to tread. It was the position held both by Dr. Denney and Dr. Robertson Smith. They were both Modernists in criticism and Evangelicals in theology. I say this is a desirable way because it means the choice of spirit before form, of principle or idea before institution. It means holding by *all* the truth, wherever that may appear.

It was this same comprehensive vision that he brought to the problem of church union. There was nothing narrow about Storr, and in this matter of unity least of all. Latterly he came to the conviction that Christian unity and the larger catholicity would be reached through worship. For example, he thought that the Holy Communion should be regarded as a *means* for the attainment of unity and not as the final far-off goal to be reached only when the complex and problems of hundreds of years of ecclesiastical differences had been resolved. He doubted if they would be solved in any other way. And one can only sigh and mutter: 'O si sic omnes.'

F. J. RAE.

Edinburgh.

Belief in God.

'The way to meet doubt is to take our stand upon the fact of our own existence as moral and spiritual persons. Let each one say to himself, "Here am I with my spiritual nature. I have a body, but I am a spirit. I have a conscience; I hear the call of the right, and something urges me to follow it. I am haunted by the presence of ideals. In my best moments I long to be better than I am. I pass judgments of value. I recognize at once that the Good and the True are worthy objects of pursuit. They shine like fixed stars in the heavens above me. I read the story of the universe, and I see—I cannot help seeing—a spiritual purpose unfolding itself. The long course of evolution has resulted in the production of persons like myself with the same spiritual nature and the same need of God to satisfy it. The whole of this spiritual side of life loses its meaning if there be no God. I will fight down my doubt by affirming my own spiritual value. I will call my will into play, that creative centre of my being, and live as if God were the most real of realities."'

¹ Vernon Faithfull Storr, by G. H. Harris, 74.

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

